DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 285 UD 029 041

AUTHOR Tierney, Joseph P.; Branch, Alvia Y.
TITLE College Students as Mentors for At-Risk Youth: A Study of Six Campus Partners in Learning Programs.
INSTITUTION Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Commonwealth Fund, New York, N.Y.; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, IL.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 105p.
AVAILABLE FROM Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106-2178.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *At Risk Persons; *College Students; Disadvantaged Youth; Helping Relationship; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Interviews; *Mentors; Minority Group Children; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Recruitment; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Boston University MA; Connecticut College; Georgetown University DC; *Partners in Learning; *Protege Mentor Relationship; West Virginia Wesleyan College; Xavier University of Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This study examined the operating characteristics of six Campus Partners in Learning programs, which team college and university students as mentors with teenagers and younger youth. The project involved four separate but closely interrelated studies: (1) an implementation study; (2) a relationship formation study; (3) an outcomes study that investigated the benefits to both parties in the mentor pair; and (4) a survey of college students. These studies were conducted at Boston University (Massachusetts); Connecticut College (New London); Georgetown University (District of Columbia); Porterville Community College (California); West Virginia Wesleyan College (Buckhannon); and Xavier University of Louisiana (New Orleans). Program elements included mentor recruitment, mentor screening, mentor training, protege orientation, matching, and mentor/protege interactions. Interviews to gauge program outcomes found that 45 percent of the participants formed successful relationships in which the mentors allowed the relationships to be youth-driven and took into account the youth's preferences for social and recreational activities before engaging them in serious discussions and academically oriented activities. Mentors exhibited improved self-esteem, perceived scholastics competence, and satisfaction with their social skills. Proteges were exposed to additional social and cultural activities and their sense of control over their lives improved. Two appendixes present data on the sites and study methodology. Sixteen references and eight tables are included. (JB)

Public/Private Ventures

P/PV

ED354285

College Students as Mentors for At-Risk Youth

A Study of Six Campus Partners in Learning Programs

Joseph P. Tierney
Alvia Y. Branch

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD029041

December 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public/Private Ventures is a national, not-for-profit corporation that designs, manages, and evaluates social policy initiatives aimed at helping youth whose lack of preparation for the work force hampers their chances for productive lives. P/PV's work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

Rex D. Adams
Chairman of the Board

Michael A. Bailin
President

Gary Walker
Executive Vice President

Board of Directors
Rex D. Adams
William R. Anton
Michael A. Bailin
Angela Glover Blackwell
Roy J. Bostock
Alan K. Campbell
Hillary Rodham Clinton
Alonzo A. Crim
Alice F. Emerson
Sandra Feldman
Mitchell S. Fromstein
David W. Hornbeck
Harold Howe II
Siobhan Oppenheimer-Nicolau
Marion Pines
John W. Porter
Harold Richman
Mitchell Svirdoff

Corporate Associates
American Express
Philanthropic Program
Amentech Foundation
ARA Services, Inc.
Borden Foundation
BP America
Citibank
D'Arcy, Masius, Benton and Bowles
Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.
Exxon Corporation
Mobil Foundation, Inc.
Penn Mutual Charitable Trust
The Prudential Foundation
Rhone-Poulenc Rorer Inc.
United Technologies

Research Advisory Committee
Frank Furstenberg
Robinson Hollister
Henry Levin
Frank Levy
Anita Summers
Marta Tienda

Public/Private Ventures
399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2178
215 592-9099

P/PV

College Students as Mentors for At-Risk Youth

A Study of Six Campus Partners in Learning Programs

Joseph P. Tierney
Alvia Y. Branch

December 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Commonwealth Fund, the Pew Charitable Trusts and an anonymous donor.

Cynthia Sipe supervised the research effort, and her support and participation were vital for completing the report. Kristine Morrow played an integral role in collecting and analyzing the data and producing the report. Melanie Styles, Kathryn Furano, Cathy Toso and Barbara Robinson interviewed program staff and participants and assisted with the analysis. Russell Jackson, Barbara Lujan and Ricardo Barnes of Decision Information Resources (DIR) assisted in the interviewing of program staff and participants. Chris Welser filled the many roles of a research assistant. All the above staff, along with Benjamin Gottlieb of the University of Guelph, participated in the development of the numerous data collection instruments.

Greg Weber performed the computer programming while Eleanor Hammond and Batia Trietsch prepared the data for analysis. The presentation of the report benefitted immeasurably from the assistance of Gary Walker, Natalie Jaffe and Michael Callaghan. Susan Tomko transcribed the interviews. Jenifer Marquis painstakingly processed the multiple drafts with assistance from Maxine Sherman, and Carol Eresian proofread the final document.

This project benefitted from the advice of Public/Private Ventures' Adult/Youth Relationships advisory board members: Richard Danzig of Latham & Watkins, Ron Ferguson of Harvard University, Frank Furstenberg of the University of Pennsylvania, Beatrix Hamburg of The William T. Grant Foundation, Harold Howe of Harvard University, Joan Schine of the Early Adolescent Helper program, Heather Weiss of Harvard University, and Emmy Werner of the University of California-Davis.

Campus Partners in Learning (CPIL) staff played a key role in this report. Brooke Beaird oversaw the research effort for CPIL and encouraged the sites to participate in the research. Laura Maxwell arranged the site visits, participated in the interviews of program staff and wrote site reports. Our thanks go to program staff who allowed us to examine their programs--Ruth Shane, Anais Troadec, Ginger Swain, Bob Braumuller, Mary Edens, Virginia Gurrola, Jean O'Halloran and Nedra Jaspar. We also want to thank all university and program staff and program participants who graciously allowed us to interview them.

CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		i
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Campus Compact	3
	The Study	6
II.	PROGRAM PREPARATIONS	9
	Program Staff	9
	Program Elements	11
	Mentor Characteristics	14
	Target Agency	16
	Mentee Characteristics	19
	Matching	19
III.	POST-MATCH ACTIVITIES	23
	Programmatic Issues	23
	The Human Factor	30
	Summary	36
IV.	COLLEGE STUDENT AND MENTEE OUTCOMES	39
	Methods	39
	Mentor Outcomes	40
	Mentee Outcomes	41
	Outcomes Summary	45
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
	Program Staffing	49
	Program Preparation	50
	Post-Match Issues	52
	Conclusion	53
REFERENCES		55

APPENDICES

A. SITE DESCRIPTIONS A-1

B. METHODS B-1

TABLES

1. PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS 5

2. DEMOGRAPHIC, EDUCATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS OF MENTORS 15

3. MENTEE DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS 20

4. PROGRAM COMPONENTS 27

5. MENTOR BASELINE AND CHANGE FROM BASELINE SCORES ON SELF-CONCEPT, COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES, AND IN GPA 42

6. CULTURAL AND SOCIAL ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES FOR MENTEES 44

7. MENTEE BASELINE AND CHANGE FROM BASELINE SCORES ON SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALES 46

8. COMPARISON OF MENTEE ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91 VS. SCHOOL YEAR 1989-90 47

PREFACE

The concept of mentoring as a discrete intervention is relatively new within the context of youth-serving programs. Although practitioners and policymakers have embraced the idea that programs can provide youth with supportive relationships, little research evidence currently exists to support this claim. Further, the concept of mentoring shares little common meaning among practitioners and no set of established best practices or operational lessons. To determine the usefulness of mentoring as an intervention in serving at-risk youth, Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) has undertaken a four-year research initiative that addresses the following questions:

1. Are there large numbers of adults with enough flexible time and emotional resources to take on the demands of mentoring at-risk youngsters?

2. Can mentoring be integrated into large-scale youth-serving institutions, specifically juvenile justice agencies?

3. Is there a set of practices or features that roughly characterizes the adult role in an effective mentoring relationship?

4. What level of training and support activities, services and costs is required to administer mentoring programs effectively? What are "best practices" in these programs--how much training, screening, matching and supervision are required or optimal?

5. Will participating in these mentoring programs make important observable changes in the attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of the at-risk young people and mentors?

Because no one study can thoroughly address all five questions, P/PV's research agenda includes a set of studies that together will provide credible evidence for answering these questions. That agenda includes studies of six college-based mentoring programs funded by Campus Compact's Campus Partners in Learning, 15 Big Brothers/Big Sisters programs, two P/PV pilot programs that match adult volunteers with youth adjudicated in the juvenile justice system, four Linking Lifetimes programs developed by Temple University's Center for Intergenerational Learning, and programs sponsored by the Washington, D.C., I Have a Dream Foundation.

The study of six Campus Partners in Learning programs, the second product of this research initiative (P/PV published the Linking Lifetimes report earlier this year), is designed to examine the potential for college students to mentor disadvantaged youth. Thus, this study examines the successes and frustrations of implementing a mentoring program on six college campuses, the key aspects of a relationship between a college student and a youth only a few years younger and the possible outcomes of participation for both mentor and mentee.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

College and university mentoring programs for teenagers and younger youth have flourished in recent years. A 1989 study found more than 1,700 mentoring and tutoring programs operating in institutions of higher education across the nation (Reisner et al., 1989). While there is a great deal of interest in these programs, little is known about them. In an effort to learn about their operating characteristics, Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) examined six of the 12 Campus Partners in Learning (CPIL) programs sponsored by the Education Commission of the States. The programs were at Boston University, Connecticut College, Georgetown University, Porterville Community College, West Virginia Wesleyan College and Xavier University.

While mentoring programs initiated by CPIL had a common programmatic core, the six programs in this study varied widely in how they implemented that core. For example, mentees' grade levels ranged from fourth to ninth grades, with seventh and eighth grade the most common levels. The programs ranged in size from eight to 24 matches. Mentees were recruited through either their school (four programs) or the public housing project in which they resided (two programs). Three programs held their meetings primarily on the college campus, two were held at the mentees' school, and the meeting location for one program was left to the mentors' discretion.

Two programs' activities consisted almost exclusively of one-to-one interaction; two focused on group meetings; one was evenly divided between individual and group interactions; and another was primarily one-to-one, but had one group meeting per month. All but one program had an academic component, but the specifics ranged from tutoring in school subject areas, to presentations on health education (e.g., AIDS awareness), to the teaching of academic skills.

This variety of programming, in addition to the programs' small size, limits the number of useful generalizations that can be made about this type of program. However, the program's core--involving college students in the lives of at-risk youth--did present common issues of logistics and relationship development across all six sites.

Our major finding is that involving college students as mentors presents special challenges, and requires administrative structure and substantive support beyond that typically provided. To participate in any community service activity, college students must perform a difficult balancing act: they must adjust to greater social responsibility and autonomy than most have previously experienced; meet exacting academic demands; and find time for community service. Moreover, those who select mentoring at-risk youth from among the many possibilities for community service take on one of the most demanding means of demonstrating their social concern.

Most of the programs we examined were not initially structured to take the unique circumstances of college student mentors into account. Programs that did offer signifi-

cant staff support to help students balance demands were the most successful in bringing mentors and youth together consistently, thereby setting the stage for the formation of constructive relationships. This support included one or more of the following: pre-match and in-program training, limits on the number of decisions the college students had to make, and limits on the amount of time and other resources the student was required to contribute.

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Mentor Recruitment. The programs had varying levels of success identifying a pool of interested college students. All programs except one sought equal numbers of men and women; program staff reported that they were able to recruit a sufficiently large group of female applicants but were unable to recruit a similar group of males. CPIL shares this problem with other mentoring programs we have examined, none of which have found a solution.

Mentor Screening. Programs that established and rigorously applied participation rules and screening procedures had higher rates of mentor attendance at program events. These programs explicitly defined rules and expectations, and required mentors to demonstrate how they would fit the program into their schedules. Mentors were given every opportunity to drop out during the screening process, and were encouraged to do so if they felt uncomfortable making the commitment.

Mentor Training. All programs had orientation or training for mentors. Our interviews with staff and participants suggest that special efforts need to be made to enable mentors to understand the following: the nature of the youth's neighborhood (perhaps using a community representative) and background information on their own mentee; program rules--i.e., what is expected of mentors and mentees in terms of behavior and attendance; that the mentoring program alone cannot and is not expected to change the youth's lives; that an authoritarian approach by the mentor will seriously impede the development of a relationship with the mentee; that the beginning of the relationship requires special patience; that expressing interest in the youth's activity preferences is a powerful means by which mentors can successfully begin relationships and develop the trust of their mentees; and that recreational or "fun" activities are in themselves enriching for the mentees, who may not otherwise have access to them.

Mentee Orientation. Five of the six programs held orientations for mentees, with sessions conducted by program directors, student coordinators and target agency liaisons. All programs described the mentor as someone who would act as a friend, or like an older brother or sister. They also discussed program requirements with youth--requirements that usually included a behavior code to follow while on campus and specific program rules (e.g., attendance at program events).

We recommend that mentee orientation add a discussion of the structure of college life (e.g., breaks, exams), and its potential effect on the mentor and mentee's time together, and of the specific activities in which the pairs might engage.

Matching. The programs generally met their objective matching criteria by pairing mentors and mentees of the same race and gender. Beyond these objective criteria, the matching philosophy was simply to pair participants whom staff felt had similar interests and would work best together.

Mentor/Mentee Interactions. There was wide variation across programs in the frequency with which mentors and mentees met. Combining one-to-one meetings and group activities, mentor attendance (based on a weekly average) ranged from 35 percent to 95 percent. In some sites, large numbers of youth had met with their mentors only once or twice.

This wide variety in the consistency of interaction was primarily a function of the level of administrative structure and support provided. In programs where there was little or modest structure and support, students had to think of an activity; contact the mentee and get his or her agreement; come up with an agreed-on date and time; get tickets and/or make reservations, if necessary; and do whatever else was required to meet the mentee on the day of the activity, including arranging for transportation. When logistical problems arose--as they often did--the mentor was left to work through them before even beginning to interact with the mentee. Programs that reduced or simplified these logistical activities--by establishing set meeting times, handling transportation and communication problems, and providing ongoing program training, support and supervision--had higher attendance rates and interaction.

Establishing set meeting times was, perhaps, the most important of these factors. The four programs that established set meeting times for all program activities--both group activities and one-to-one interaction--had higher attendance rates (70 to 90%) than the two programs that did not (35 to 40%).

The four programs that either provided transportation or required mentors to have transportation of their own had higher attendance than the two that did not. The combination of having set meeting times and making transportation easy for participants resulted in the highest attendance rates.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

Program directors spent from four to 30 hours a week on the project, and all but one program enlisted student coordinators to assist. While we cannot definitively state the amount of professional staff time necessary to make these programs operate effectively, our best estimate is that 20 hours per week is probably the minimum, even for small programs like these. The special circumstances and challenges of involving college

students with at-risk youth make a significant level of professional administration and support necessary. It also appears that, depending on their professional training, most program directors would benefit from the help of a resource person familiar with relationship formation and adolescent development issues.

In addition, we believe that the likelihood that pairs will meet and that mentees will benefit would increase with the addition of a staff person to function as an advocate for the mentees--someone with knowledge of the youth, access to program staff and authority to resolve problems that arise. Establishing this role would make the program more responsive to the youth's needs; the current focus of the programs we examined is primarily on the college students.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Individual outcomes were gauged in two ways: through in-depth interviews with 29 pairs of mentors and youth; and through questionnaires administered to 52 youth and 50 mentors.

The interviews show that 45 percent (13 of 29 interviewed) formed successful relationships, when success is defined by the sum of a youth's satisfaction with both the mentor and the relationship, the duration of the relationship, and the youth's desire that it continue.

The mentors in successful relationships had a common approach to their mentees: they allowed the relationships to be youth-driven. That is, they took into account the youth's preferences for social and recreational activities before engaging them in serious discussions and academically oriented activities. This required a certain degree of role flexibility--knowing when to be something akin to a peer or older sibling, and when to take on a role similar to that of a teacher or coach.

Responses to the questionnaires showed the following: the mentors exhibited improvements in self-esteem, perceived scholastic competence and satisfaction with their social skills, but did not show improvements in communication skills, grade point averages or the sense that they could change the world. The mentees were exposed to additional social and cultural activities, and their sense of control over their lives improved, but there were no behavioral changes nor improvements in academic performance.

Overall, one should view the interview and questionnaire results cautiously. Several factors--inconsistently implemented programs, a small sample, high sample attrition and the lack of a comparison group--all make it less likely that the research could demonstrate definitively that participation in a campus-based mentoring program has an effect on college students or mentees. Such definitive statements require a larger, summative study.

CONCLUSION

College students and at-risk youth formed successful relationships in fewer than half the matches (45%) that were made. The attendance rates by college mentors varied widely among the six programs, from 35 percent to 95 percent.

This seemingly modest rate of relationship formation and wide variation in attendance partly reflect the newness of the programs and the staff's inexperience in running them. However, the challenge of implementing effective mentoring programs for at-risk youth that utilize college students extends beyond gaining experience. College student participation in this type of community service--which involves developing a relationship with a younger person and thereby has special risks of failure--also requires a significant level of planning, and a commitment of resources to administration and support services.

I. INTRODUCTION

College and university tutoring and mentoring programs have flourished in recent years. A 1989 study found more than 1,700 programs operating in institutions of higher education across the nation (Reisner et al., 1989). In them, more than 60,000 college students worked with upward of 200,000 at-risk youth who were doing poorly in school. These programs are an interesting amalgam of responses to several distinct and complicated issues.

These programs are different from most other mentoring programs in that their explicit goals include positive outcomes for mentors as well as mentees. Like programs that rely on older adults, college mentoring programs attempt to redress some of the well-documented needs of at-risk youth. However, they do so through a mechanism that harnesses the interest, energy, enthusiasm and abilities of young adults in college--who are themselves in need of positive experiences in order to make a successful connection to the adult world they are poised to enter.

If the programs are to be successful, their design must adequately take into account three factors: the special needs and sensitivities of the youth in poverty; the strengths and limitations of the college student mentors; and the resources of the colleges and universities.

Public/Private Ventures' (P/PV) study of six Campus Partners in Learning (CPIL) programs conducted throughout the 1990-91 academic year, was designed to examine the potential of college students as mentors. This study of the CPIL project affords a welcome opportunity to further develop knowledge about the mentoring intervention.

BACKGROUND

As they move through adolescence and attempt to make positive connections with society, youth need caring and consistent relationships with adults--not only parents, but neighbors, coaches, teachers and grandparents as well. However, widespread family breakdown, the erosion of many neighborhood ties, and the time demands of work have led one social scientist to assert that "few young people in America have even one significant, close relationship with a non-familial adult before reaching adulthood themselves" (Steinberg, 1991). The situation is even more severe for at-risk youth. In fact, the number of youth growing up in single-parent households is increasing: over 20 percent of all youth and over 40 percent of minority youth live in homes in which the father is absent.

Moreover, there are fewer nonrelated adults in poor inner-city neighborhoods who can serve as positive role models for these youth. William Julius Wilson (1987) noted the limited number of role models in isolated urban neighborhoods--places "where relatively few working adults reside, where youth gangs are especially strong and where the perils

of substance abuse take an enormous toll. This leaves at-risk youth in greater danger with fewer supports than their counterparts in more affluent circumstances."

For many inner-city youth, the lack of support for academic achievement is a particular problem. This theme is consistently displayed throughout the major institutions of youth socialization--families, peers and schools. Role models--parental and nonparental--exert a strong influence on youth's academic motivation. With the departure of middle- and working-class families from inner-city neighborhoods, at-risk youth have few educated role models who might inspire a desire for academic achievement.

There is no dearth, however, of role models antithetical to academic success. Peer pressure not to succeed academically may be a particularly strong influence for black youth: two studies note that youth who strive for academic success are sometimes criticized for "acting white" (Oden et al., 1992; Ogbu, 1986).

Mentoring: Part of the Solution?

The question that has inevitably been raised is whether, given the scarcity of naturally occurring relationships in the lives of at-risk youth, mentoring programs that pair them with nonrelated adults can fill a significant need. There is a small and growing body of research that suggests that mentoring programs can, indeed, facilitate the development of supportive relationships between these youth and nonrelated adults. Freedman (1988) and Styles and Morrow (1992) found that, on average, 67 percent of all elder/youth pairs in the intergenerational programs they studied formed mutually satisfying relationships.

An equally important consideration, however, is whether a sufficient number of adults are willing and able to serve in these roles. If mentoring is to live up to its full potential, the recruitment of supportive adults is key. Casual estimates of the numbers of mentors needed run high--the One-to-One Foundation called for one million mentors to be paired with at-risk youth nationwide. The Department of Labor initiated a project challenging 5,000 businesses to recruit 10 percent of their employees as mentors.

The basis for these figures and what they suggest is unclear. What is clear, however, is that virtually every mentoring program that has opened its doors has seen more youth seeking mentors than adults seeking to become mentors.

College Students: Service Providers and Service Recipients

In the search for potential mentors, speculation has focused on college students--a large cohort thought to have sizable amounts of discretionary time and other assets for mentoring: energy, idealism and a desire to serve. Their youth is also valued. College students are generally adolescents themselves, and likely share many of the concerns and experiences of the early adolescents with whom they would be paired.

However, college students cannot be viewed solely as service providers. They are attempting to complete a number of psychosocial tasks that are important to their own transition into adulthood. These tasks include the acquisition of identity and values, the development of social interaction skills, and the development of competencies necessary for adult roles.

Of the multiple settings in which adolescent development occurs--families, schools, neighborhoods and communities--college is unique. It provides students with a proving ground for experimentation with adult roles--a time of both freedom and pressure, with the future strongly influenced by the successful navigation of academics, extracurricular activities and other experiences. Charged with assisting students in making this transition, institutions of higher education seek to instill in them not only academic competence, but also an awareness of what they need to do to function as sensitive, knowledgeable and capable citizens.

The task of providing students with nonacademic preparation for life has fallen, traditionally, to student service agencies. Student service professionals have used student activities, student government and dormitory life to influence personal and social development. More recently, however, they have looked to community service (Serow, 1991). Programs have been designed to promote the development of leadership skills and to provide increased contact with and knowledge of the surrounding community.

College students who actively participate in community service must perform a difficult balancing act: adjusting to greater social autonomy than they have previously experienced; meeting exacting academic demands; and finding time for community service. Those who select mentoring at-risk youth from among the many possibilities for community service are selecting one of the most demanding means of demonstrating their concern; nevertheless, a large number of students in colleges and universities across the country have opted to take on this challenge.

CAMPUS COMPACT

One of the larger campus-based community service initiatives is Campus Compact. Campus Compact is a national nonprofit organization created in 1985 to develop public service opportunities for students and to implement the policies and procedures that encourage and support them in civic involvement. An important goal of the organization is to capitalize on student enthusiasm about social issues by providing them with opportunities to serve the communities in which the member institutions are located.

Headquartered at Brown University, Campus Compact is a project of the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Its 300 member institutions share information and technical assistance for the purpose of supporting established public service programs and assisting in the design and implementation of new programs.

Recently, Campus Compact has made the establishment of mentoring projects a priority and has targeted students at risk of dropping out of school. With funding from the MacArthur Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and an anonymous donor, Campus Compact and ECS established a five-year initiative known as Campus Partners in Learning (CPIL) in 1988. Under the direction of Campus Compact staff, CPIL provides information, technical assistance, and financial support to member institutions in developing mentoring programs and ensuring that college students are supported in their mentoring efforts. The program also serves as a clearinghouse for information relevant to campus-based mentoring programs serving at-risk youth, and encourages the collaboration of higher education institutions with local school systems, community organizations and state policymakers.

CPIL made seed grants of $15,000 each over a two-year period to 12 member institutions to establish mentoring programs that pair college students with disadvantaged youth. Each institution provided a $15,000 match to the seed grant. Programs at six of these institutions are the focus of this study of the social policy potential of college mentoring programs. During the study period, three programs were in their first year of operation; three others were in their third.

National CPIL staff issued broad guidelines for campus-based program staff. Each program would have 10 to 20 matches; mentors would be required to commit to the program for one academic year; mentees would be in the fourth through ninth grades and at risk of dropping out of school; pairs would meet on a one-to-one basis for a minimum of three hours a week; the program would encompass tutoring; and mentors would receive 10 to 20 hours of training.

The programs reflected these broad guidelines in their design. As shown in Table 1, programs ranged in size from eight to 24 matches. The mentees were in fact in the fourth through ninth grades, with seventh and eighth grade the most common levels.[1] Mentees were recruited through either a school (four programs) or a housing project (two programs). Three programs held their meetings primarily on the college campus, two held meetings at the mentees' school, and the remaining program left meeting location to the mentors' discretion.

Two programs consisted almost exclusively of one-to-one interaction, two were almost exclusively group-focused, one was evenly divided, and the other was primarily one-to-one but had one group meeting a month. All but one program had an academic component, but the specifics ranged from tutoring in subject areas to presentations on health education (e.g., AIDS awareness) and the teaching of academic skills (e.g., to improve writing, one program had the mentees work on a newsletter for their housing project).

---

[1]See Appendix A for individual site descriptions.

Table 1

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Program[a] 1	2	3	4	5	6
Matched Pairs	20	22	20	13	8	24
Mentee Grades in School	6-8	5-9	7-9	9	4-5	6-8
Target Agency	Middle School	Housing Project	Housing Project	High School	Elementary School	Middle School
Primary Meeting Location	Variable	Campus	Campus	School	School	Campus
Program Director Budgeted Hours Per Week	4	30	15	8	15	10
Student Coordinators	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Direct Parental Involvement	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Years in Operation	3	3	1	1	1	3

[a]Since the purpose of this research is an examination of college student mentoring in general rather than an evaluation of particular programs, programs are discussed without identifying individual sites.

The budgeted time for the program directors ranged from four to 30 hours a week, with three directors budgeted for between 10 and 15 hours. All but one program had student coordinators. While all programs encouraged parents to support the program by facilitating their child's participation, only one program directly involved parents by requiring them to attend program activities.

Program staff expected that the experience of serving as a mentor would develop the college students' leadership skills, sense of community and sense that they can make a difference in the world. Each program focused on achieving similar outcomes for mentees: increased self-esteem; greater exposure to cultural, social and recreational opportunities; improved academic performance; and reduced antisocial behavior.

THE STUDY

P/PV's study addressed the following questions specific to campus-based mentoring programs:

Will adequate numbers of college students volunteer to become mentors? As previously noted, mentoring programs have seldom been able to recruit the numbers of mentors they have sought. Nor have they been able to recruit the kinds of mentors they have sought--in particular, the minority and minority male mentors who, following the preferred practice in mentoring programs, could be paired in same-race, same-gender matches with the minority youth served by these programs. Are campus-based programs likely to be more or less successful in recruiting mentors than programs that recruit older adults?

What kinds of relationships form between college students and at-risk youth? Does the proximity in the mentors' and mentees' ages affect--either positively or negatively--the kind of relationships they form? Thus far, P/PV's research has shown that in intergenerational programs, the majority of elder mentors form effective relationships with their mentees. Are college students--because they partake of the same language, youth subculture, and concerns about school, dating and parents--more likely to form effective relationships with at-risk youth? Or should one anticipate fewer effective relationships because college students experience role confusion about the best way to relate to their charges--as older siblings, as peers, or as authority figures akin to parents or teachers?

What program practices make the most sense for college-based mentoring programs? What practices are the least effective? How do these variations in program practices affect the likelihood that effective relationships will be formed between college student mentors and their mentees? Like other mentoring programs, campus-based programs must develop policies and procedures to govern a wide range of program implementation tasks. The study of CPIL has allowed us to assess the relative efficacy of a number of program practices, among them the necessary organizational and logistical support; the need for training; the role of supervision; the balance between tutoring and mentoring;

the relative emphasis on one-to-one and group activities; the balance between concern for the needs of the college student and concern for the needs of the at-risk youth; and, more generally, the degree of structure that should undergird a college mentoring program.

Does participation in college mentoring programs result in positive outcomes for the mentees? For the college students? If so, in what areas? Do at-risk youth show gains in educational aspiration and performance, as well as in self-esteem and other measures of psychological well-being? Do the college student mentors reap similar benefits?

By addressing such questions, we are able to suggest ways in which colleges and universities can best support these fledgling programs and the college students and at-risk youth who participate in them, and delineate lessons that can enrich the state of the art in the mentoring field.

Chapter II of this report describes CPIL's programmatic elements through the matching of participants; these elements include the organization of program staff and the recruiting, training, screening and matching of program participants. Chapter III discusses formal program activities, participant attendance at those events, and key features of the relationship between college student and mentee. Chapter IV discusses the outcomes of participation for mentor and mentee. Chapter V presents programmatic recommendations and our conclusions. Appendix A describes the seven sites originally selected to participate in the research, and Appendix B offers a technical discussion of the research methods.

II. PROGRAM PREPARATIONS

Campus mentoring programs are different from other social programs in that they are constrained by a calendar developed for purposes other than those of the program. The academic calendar, typically consisting of two 14- or 15-week semesters, defines the length of the program and punctuates the service with holiday breaks and exams.

The academic calendar dictates the urgency of the pre-match phase, since the longer it takes program staff to complete this phase, the shorter the intervention. Since the pre-match phase typically lasts six weeks, nearly half of the first semester will be spent by the end of the pre-match period. Even under ideal conditions, the intervention is generally no longer than 20 weeks--approximately 13 of which are in the spring semester.

During the pre-match phase of the program, the workload for program and target agency staff is the most intensive of the year. Failure to perform adequately the essential tasks of recruiting, training and matching program participants diminishes the likelihood that the program will positively affect mentors and mentees.

This chapter describes and analyzes the CPIL programs' elements up to and including the matching of program participants. Participant characteristics are also presented. The analysis focuses particularly on the organization of the programs and the preparation of participants for the mentoring relationship.

The analysis is based on interviews with program and target agency staff at all six sites. First interviews were conducted in Fall 1990, and a second round of interviews was conducted near the end of the 1990-91 academic year.[2]

PROGRAM STAFF

All programs had a project director and all but one had two or more student coordinators. The amount of time these staff spent on the program and the availability of additional staff resources varied considerably. Project directors' time on the programs ranged from four to 30 hours per week; student coordinators spent from eight to 10 hours per week.

The responsibilities of project directors and student coordinators involved program design, selection of a target agency, fundraising, planning and executing a recruitment campaign, interviewing program participants, coordinating program activities with the target agency, serving as the liaison with the target agency, matching, planning program

---

[2]Since the purpose of this research is an examination of college student mentoring in general rather than an evaluation of particular programs, differences in program practices are discussed without identifying individual sites.

activities, coordinating transportation, communicating with the mentors, accounting for program expenses, and supervising the matches.

Project directors and student coordinators divided these responsibilities differently across programs. The programs' ability to meet their stated goals relied largely on how well the staff coordinated responsibilities and executed their duties.

Project Director

The director had overall responsibility for the project, including selecting and monitoring the student coordinators. In most sites, the project director took sole responsibility for program design, selection of a target agency, and fundraising. The director shared several other duties with the student coordinators, including recruiting and supervising mentors, matching, planning program activities, and supervising matches.

No project director worked 40 hours a week on the program, and all but one had other responsibilities, usually to other community service programs. Thus, the directors had to decide which responsibilities or programs most needed their time.

Student Coordinators

Student coordinators are usually responsible for running program activities, coordinating transportation, communicating with program participants and/or doing paperwork. They also consult with project directors and share the aforementioned duties with them. In addition, almost all the student coordinators served as mentors.

Since programs must literally begin on the first day of the semester, programs selected student coordinators the previous spring. In selecting coordinators, programs' primary criteria were a commitment to the program and a willingness to put in the necessary time to accomplish its goals.[3] Most directors expected that student coordinators who had previously served as a mentor would be most effective, since they would appreciate the special character of the programs. In fact, most coordinators who were recruited were thus qualified. Previous coordinator experience at another community service program was also seen as helpful.

Other Staff

Most programs supplemented the efforts of program directors and student coordinators. Typically, they did so by using administrative assistants, counselors, professional caseworkers or community liaisons.

---

[3]Most coordinators received work/study money for time spent on program logistics. They were not paid for time spent mentoring.

Two programs had counselors--one a chaplain and one a psychologist--who were available to the mentors to discuss match-specific issues. In one program, a caseworker from the local Big Brothers/Big Sisters agency was available to assist with the selection of mentors and mentees and to monitor the matches. Most programs had administrative assistants, who handled such logistical work as informing mentors of scheduling changes.

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

During the pre-match period, program staff must recruit, screen and train the mentors; plan program activities; and ensure that the referral and preparation of mentees proceeds as planned. Typically, the program director sets up and manages the process while the student coordinators carry out the work.

Programs must maintain a tight timeline during the pre-match phase, with each responsibility being completed quickly and correctly. Both directors and student coordinators must spend as much time as necessary during this period to make the program work; they cannot limit their activities to budgeted hours. The urgency of the pre-match phase is largely dictated by the nature of the academic calendar. Even if the phase goes as scheduled, six weeks of the fall semester will be gone by the time matches are made.

Mentor Recruitment

The first challenge faced by programs in the pre-match period is identifying and recruiting a sufficient number of qualified mentors. At programs we studied, recruitment began during the first days of the semester and lasted an average of two to three weeks.[4]

The recruitment process involves a period of learning for both staff and prospective mentors. The students learn about the program and gain sufficient information to make an informed decision as to whether they want to participate. At the same time, program staff begin to determine whether each college student is appropriate for the program.

As a first step, programs familiarized the campus community with the program by circulating flyers, hanging posters, making presentations in classes or to student organizations, participating in fairs, or using previous mentors to do word-of-mouth recruiting. One community service center incorporated the mentoring program into the general recruitment it conducted for all its programs.

Although programs used many of the same strategies, the emphasis placed on specific strategies varied by site. Strategy decisions usually depended on the type of college student the staff wanted to recruit. The directors in the two smallest programs (eight

---

[4]One program began recruitment in the spring. A second program originally recruited in the spring but stopped when the attrition rate over the summer proved to be too high. Staff attributed the high attrition to a shift in prospective mentors' interests and to conflicts with their academic schedules.

and 13 matches, respectively) personally recruited mentors. This strategy was effective because the directors were able to select the college students they felt would make the best mentors. This type of personal recruiting, though it seems to be the most effective, is severely constrained by the size of the program, since there are limits to the number of students about whom directors can make such a determination.

In three of the other four programs, the preference to make same-race matches was a major factor in determining which recruitment strategies to emphasize.[5] Program staff at these colleges made presentations to minority student organizations, and student coordinators and former mentors used word-of-mouth recruiting among members of the minority community in an effort to spur interest in the programs. Enlisting the support of leaders of minority student organizations also brought minority students forward; one program was able to recruit the presidents of two such organizations, greatly increasing the program's visibility and credibility in the minority community.

Programs had varying levels of success in identifying a pool of interested college students. The programs, all but one of which sought equal numbers of men and women, were generally able to recruit a sufficiently large group of women applicants--one program turned away 25 female candidates--but were unable to recruit a similar group of male applicants. Staff were generally unable to attribute the difficulty of recruiting male candidates to any specific factor. One director described "intense" competition among programs for black males; other programs also reported difficulty recruiting white males.

Mentor Screening

After identifying a group of interested mentors, the programs put them through a series of screening procedures. Differences among programs here were generally not in the screening procedures themselves, but in how rigorously they were applied. Typically, programs required mentors to attend an informational meeting, complete an application, be interviewed by program staff and submit personal references.

The programs that rigorously applied their screening procedures had higher rates of mentor attendance at program events. These programs explicitly defined program rules and expectations and required mentors to demonstrate how they would fit the program into their schedules. Mentors in these programs were given every opportunity to drop out during the screening process and were encouraged to do so if they felt uncomfortable making the commitment.

When screening faltered, it was often because staff succumbed to time pressures. The recruitment process frequently took longer than expected and staff had to speed up the

[5]Mentees at these three programs were either black or Hispanic. The fourth was an historically black college. Since the mentees were all black as well, the decision to make same-race matches did not affect recruiting.

screening process so that matches could begin. Because of the difficulty in recruiting a sufficient number of male mentors, staff tended to relax screening standards for male applicants so they could fill a predetermined number of slots with males.

Many programs also did not screen rigorously enough with regard to determining the students' available time. The programs were described as requiring three to five hours a week. This time commitment, however, reflected only the time that mentor and mentee were expected to spend together. Attending mentor meetings, planning weekly activities and contacting the mentees all take time--usually more time than anticipated. Many programs did not effectively communicate this to the mentors, nor did they require mentors to demonstrate how they would fit the program into their weekly schedules.

In short, the screening process was unevenly implemented. At times, staff fell victim to temporal demands and pushed the process along more rapidly than was advisable.

Mentor Training

Five of the six programs provided mentor training, but the topics and modes of presentation varied by site.[6] Three sites held all-day on-campus sessions; the other two conducted overnight retreats.

Typically, program directors ran the training sessions with significant input from student coordinators. Occasionally, the efforts of regular program staff were supplemented, usually by someone familiar with the characteristics of the mentees or their community.

In addition to helping programs transmit instrumental information on program structures and expectations, the training sessions provided opportunities for team-building. Mentors who discussed the team-building exercises reported that the sense of camaraderie was helpful as they struggled with similar problems through the course of the program.

Training also helped mentors anticipate the realities of a relationship with an at-risk youth. Most college students are far removed from the mentees' world. Many mentors are from middle- or upper-class backgrounds and have never faced the stark realities confronted daily by these youth. Training, then, provides an opportunity for the mentors to come to an understanding of the life circumstances of the mentees, and their responses to them. One mentor expressed a strong need for this type of training:

> It's amazing when working with these kids, you look at them and they've got on Nikes and Reeboks and the most expensive shoes that--like my shoes look like I bought them at the flea market. And that just sort of throws me off sometimes and my friend said that, you know, you don't have

[6]The sixth site planned to conduct training, but never did so due to delays in other pre-match program activities.

> very nice shoes, James,[7] but you have a car and you live in a house. So while it's realistic for you to reach for these goals, their only perceived, you know, reachable goal is a pair of shoes like that. So your car is their shoes. And that's very important for me to hear.

A second mentor expressed similar feelings: "It's hard for well-off students to understand the desperation of these kids, who feel the need to grasp what they can while they have the chance." Training can prepare mentors for these situations and help them avoid inappropriate responses that can impede relationship development.[8]

The most common means of teaching mentors about situations they were likely to encounter was the role-play. Experienced mentors presented situations and the group discussed the appropriate response. While these role-plays provided an introduction to what a mentor could expect, many mentors reported that the role-plays were too abstract or remote for them to appreciate.

There were also program guideline and program planning aspects to the training sessions. Program guidelines included telling mentors how to respond when they suspected that their mentee was the victim of physical or sexual abuse, and who should be contacted with questions regarding the program. Program planning centered on the organization and topics of future program activities.

MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

Table 2 presents the demographic, educational and community service characteristics of the mentors who began the program at the six sites. The majority of mentors were females (64.3%) and members of a racial or ethnic minority group (70.2%). As mentioned earlier, the gender disparity was not by design. Most programs intended to recruit similar numbers of men and women, but were unable to find enough male applicants--a situation that is consistent with the experience of other tutoring/mentoring programs (Reisner et al., 1989).

The disproportionate number of minority mentors, on the other hand, was a function of program design. Since every program wanted to make same-race matches, all programs except one that served white mentees focused recruiting efforts on minority students. Only one program that attempted to recruit minority students was unsuccessful in doing so, and this was expected due to the small number (125) of minority students at the school.

---

[7]All names included in excerpts from interviews have been changed to protect participants' identities.

[8]The problems that occur when mentors respond to youth inappropriately are discussed in Chapter III.

Table 2

DEMOGRAPHIC, EDUCATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS OF MENTORS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	
Gender	
Male	35.7%
Female	64.3
Race/Ethnicity	
White	29.8%
Black	54.8
Hispanic	10.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.4
Other	2.4
Mean Age	19.7
Grew up in two-parent household	62.7%
Mean Number of Siblings	2.4
Grew up in urban area	52.4%
Class Status	
Upper class	4.8%
Upper middle class	23.8
Middle class	48.8
Working class	20.2
Not sure	2.4
Attend religious services 2+ times/month	39.3%
EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	
Mean GPA	3.1
Year in school	
Freshman	27.4%
Sophomore	34.5
Junior	25.0
Senior	9.5
Other	3.6
Major	
Social sciences	65.1%
Business	14.5
Physical sciences	15.7
Education	2.4
Undecided	2.4
COMMUNITY SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS	
Parents ever involved in community service	83.3%
Respondents involved in community service (last two years)	83.1%
Sample Size	84

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

The mentors described themselves as primarily middle-class (48.8%), with the balance divided fairly equally between upper middle-class (23.8%) and working-class (20.2%) students. A substantial amount of "economic distance" existed between mentors and mentees, since almost 80 percent (77.5%) of the mentors were from middle- or upper-class backgrounds and all the mentees were economically disadvantaged.

The mentors were slightly better than B students, with an average grade point average (GPA) of 3.1. They were drawn almost equally from the freshman (27.4%), sophomore (34.5%) and junior classes (25%). Program staff tended not to recruit seniors unless they had previously served as a mentor. Most staff viewed seniors as having insufficient time to devote to the program, given the need for them to make their postgraduation job or school plans. Most mentors were social science majors (65.1%), with some physical science (15.7%) and business (14.5%) majors. Most mentors had previous community service experience.[9] Over 80 percent (83.1%) had been involved in community service in the preceding 24 months.

TARGET AGENCY

The CPIL programs were run in conjunction with a target agency--either a school (four programs) or a housing project (two programs). The target agencies provided the youth for the programs, personal knowledge of the mentees, logistical support and, in some cases, the primary meeting spot for mentors and mentees. Program staff selected target agencies for a variety of reasons, but a common (and important) factor across all sites was the existence of a previously established relationship between the target agency (or a key person at the agency) and the college or the program director. In many cases, the college had run other community service projects at the target agency.

Since target agencies were selected primarily on the basis of previous relationships with the college or program staff, proximity to the college was not a consideration. Thus, excepting one site that was within walking distance, programs were forced to consider transportation in their planning process. Three programs provided transportation (campus vans or cars), one required that mentors have their own means of transportation, and the other left transportation to the mentors.

Mentee Referral

An important duty for target agency staff was referring mentees to the program. While campus-based program staff focused their efforts on recruiting, screening and training mentors, target site staff selected and prepared mentees for the program. They identified a group of mentees whom they felt would benefit from the program, obtained per-

---

[9]Community service was defined as all work or service provided by individuals through campus organizations, businesses, or public or private community agencies that contributes to the quality of life of individuals, communities or societies. Such work may be voluntary, for pay or for course credit.

mission from parents for these youth to participate, and provided them with an orientation to the program.

The consensus among agency staff was that most youth in the school or the housing project could benefit from the program. At five of the six programs, teachers or guidance counselors recommended a group of youth; at the other site, a single representative performed this task. The one constant in the instructions given to target agency staff was to recommend youth who were academically at risk. This included youth who had experienced or were on the verge of experiencing academic problems. The academic criteria reflected CPIL's guideline that mentees be at risk of dropping out of school.

A highly subjective criterion used at most sites was that the youth be "on the edge but not over it"--i.e., they were at risk but not so seriously at risk that they were beyond the helping skills of a college student. This instruction was interpreted broadly, with target agency staff referring some youth who had low self-concept, were quiet or shy, had emerging behavior problems or faced difficult family situations.

After eliminating the best students and the most difficult youth, i.e., those who needed more help than a college student could provide, target agency staff in most sites were still left with a large pool from which to draw. However, since many of those making the referrals did not have clear guidelines, their determinations of who would benefit most from the program were largely idiosyncratic.

One program issued open invitations, and all youth who agreed to comply with program rules were accepted. Another program identified a surplus of youth and issued invitations to all of them, knowing that many would not accept.

One site employed a more rigorous process, asking all teachers in the sixth and seventh grades to prepare a list of students whom they thought would benefit. Youth who appeared on more than one list were considered prime candidates. The liaison reviewed these youth and selected those she thought would benefit most.

To avoid stigmatization, youth recruited by programs were told that they had been selected for a special program. Many program staff tried diligently to make the mentees feel honored that they had been accepted.

The mentees were given a consent form to take home for their parent(s) to sign. In one site, parents were also interviewed before their children were accepted.

Target Agency Liaison

Each target agency designated a primary contact to act as liaison with program staff. The contact served as the communication link between the college and the target agency

and coordinated the logistics of the target agency support. The primary contacts' efforts were often supplemented by other teachers or counselors.

The contacts provided information on the personal situation of each youth. Contacts in school-based target agencies tended to provide better information on the youth's academic situations, while contacts at the housing projects generally provided somewhat better information concerning the youth's home lives. Mentors reported that the personal information served as a valuable background resource as they prepared to interact with mentees, but added that even more information regarding the youth and their families would have helped them develop a relationship with their mentees more quickly.

Target agency staff had additional responsibilities when participants met at their location. In two programs, participants met primarily at the target agency; in two other programs, they occasionally met at the agency. In these programs, target agency staff secured meeting space and helped participants arrange their meetings to accommodate everyone's schedule.

Not all target agency staff outside of the primary contact initially understood the purpose of the program. This was particularly critical in programs where the majority of the mentor/mentee interaction took place at the target agency. While target agency staff were eventually supportive, additional information would have brought needed help. For example, one teacher said she would have liked to help the mentors by providing additional information about the mentees and even participating in some of the group activities; however, she said that no one ever asked for her assistance. There were also logistical kinks, such as a case where the college and the school failed to exchange calendars, resulting in mentors or mentees expecting to have a meeting, only to find that their partner was on school break.

Most of the target agency's efforts were directed at serving as a liaison with the program director or student coordinators, and handling logistical considerations, such as providing a meeting place. No one was designated as a person to whom the mentees could bring problems or questions.

Mentee Orientation

Five of the six programs conducted an orientation for mentees. The sixth program, which did not have a formal group orientation, incorporated some of the topics others built into orientation into its mentee screening procedures.

Orientations were conducted by an array of staff--program directors, student coordinators and target agency liaisons all participated. All programs described the mentor as someone who would act as a friend or like an older brother or older sister. They also discussed program requirements with youth; these requirements usually included a behavior code to follow while on campus and specific program rules (e.g., attendance at program

events). Most program staff informed the mentees that disruptive behavior would not be tolerated.

Of the five programs that conducted orientations, three provided only brief sessions that focused primarily on program rules and scheduling. Two programs provided more extensive orientations in which they discussed the meaning of being a mentee and the meaning of being in a relationship; however, only one of these programs explicitly prepared the mentees for what they could expect from the mentors.

Since only a few mentees had previously participated in a mentoring program, they had no a priori concept of what was involved. The pre-match orientation was the programs' opportunity to address this issue. The programs generally presented only one side of the story, discussing appropriate behavior for mentees but not mentors. They briefly described program activities, but did not tell mentees of the idiosyncracies of college life (e.g., school breaks, exams) and how they would be affected; match life-cycle issues were also not discussed.

MENTEE CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3 presents the demographic and educational characteristics of the mentees.[10] There were more females (56.9%) than males (43.1%), and most were black (73.4%). They ranged in age from 10 to 14, with about 80 percent (78.3%) between 11 and 13 years old. Almost all mentees (95.3%) were living with their mother, but only 47.7 percent were living with their father or stepfather.

The mentees were enrolled in the fifth through ninth grades, and were evenly divided between the fifth and sixth grades and the seventh through ninth grades. Over 40 percent (43.1%) reported having repeated a grade, but only 23.1 percent reported receiving average grades of C or lower. About 10 percent (10.8%) indicated that they were not doing any homework, while 23.1 percent said that they were doing more than one hour of homework per night.

Although information regarding their family's economic characteristics was not obtained from the mentees, we will assume that all were economically at risk, based on descriptions by program staff, the neighborhoods where the mentees lived, and the fact that the majority received free or reduced-price lunches.

MATCHING

The final step before officially beginning the program was for program staff to decide which participants to pair. All six programs planned to pair participants of the same

[10]Mentee data were collected at only three of the six sites. See Appendix B for a discussion of data collection.

Table 3

MENTEE DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	
Gender	
Male	43.1%
Female	56.9
Race/Ethnicity	
Black	73.4%
Hispanic	23.4
Other	3.1
Age	
10	10.0%
11	28.3
12	28.3
13	21.7
14	11.7
Living with Mother	95.3%
Living with Father or Stepfather	47.7%
EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS	
Year in School	
5th Grade	7.7%
6th Grade	43.1
7th Grade	26.2
8th Grade	21.5
9th Grade	1.5
Grades	
Mostly As	3.1%
Mostly As and Bs	18.5
Mostly Bs	18.5
Mostly Bs and Cs	36.9
Mostly Cs	9.2
Mostly Cs and Ds	10.8
Mostly Ds and Fs	3.1
Time Spent on Homework Per School Night	
Don't Have it or Don't Do it	10.8%
1 - 29 Minutes	30.8
30 - 60 Minutes	35.4
60+ Minutes	23.1
Ever Repeated a Grade	43.1%
Sample Size	65

Note: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

race and same gender, believing that such matches provided mentees with the best role models. In addition, all but one program wanted to pair each college student with only one youth.[11]

The programs were largely successful in meeting these objective matching criteria. Eighty percent of the mentees received mentors of the same race and 95 percent received mentors of the same gender. The programs did not achieve 100 percent same-gender, same-race matches because one college was unable to recruit a sufficient number of minority mentors (18 of the 22 matches were cross-race), and one did not have enough male mentors (five of the eight matches paired female mentors with male mentees). Staff were also successful in making one-to-one matches. Only one program assigned two youth to a mentor and did so for only two mentors.

Beyond these objective criteria, the programs applied a series of subjective measures, most of which involved gauging personal interests. Data on personal interests were collected from applications, interviews and, in one case, a formal personality profile. The way in which programs used this information varied; often, the only real matching philosophy was program staff's gut instinct on who would make the best combination.

Two programs attempted to match the academic needs of the mentees with the academic skills of the mentors. For example, a youth in need of help with algebra was not matched with a mentor enrolled in a remedial math course. These two programs had the greatest focus on tutoring, making it easier to use objective criteria.

One program primarily and two others partially used a matching philosophy referred to as self-selection. With self-selection, a mentor and mentee pair up naturally, usually during some type of informal get-together. While self-selection may result in some very good matches, it can create problems with youth who are not selected or are selected by someone they did not want. One mentee described not being selected by the mentor that she wanted: "There was this other girl, she had long hair, I didn't know her name, and I wanted her. She was funny. And so I wanted her, but she didn't pick me."

In summary, the programs generally met their objective matching criteria by pairing on a one-to-one basis mentors and mentees of the same race and same gender. Beyond these objective criteria, the matching philosophy was simply to match participants who staff felt had similar interests and who, on the basis of staff's gut instinct, would work best together.

---

[11]One program originally planned for each mentor to have two mentees. The meeting times, however, were scheduled separately so that the interaction would still be one-to-one. When fewer mentees than anticipated responded to invitations to join, the program matched each mentor with one youth. During the program year, two mentees were added, resulting in two mentors having two mentees.

This chapter has discussed the organization of the programs and the preparation of program participants for a mentoring relationship. Chapter III discusses program activities, participant reaction to these activities, and the relationships that formed between college students and youth.

III. POST-MATCH ACTIVITIES

In the realm of social programming, mentoring is unique. It does not involve the provision of goods and services, the delivery of a curriculum or the transfer of income. Rather, it largely consists of the interactions that take place between two individuals. In order for mentoring to work, then, or even to have a chance at working, the two individuals must meet. In mentoring programs, the role of the program staff is to facilitate these meetings. In the sections that follow, we discuss the extent to which the pairs met in the college mentoring programs we studied, and the program practices that facilitated or hindered their meeting.

In and of themselves, meetings obviously do not constitute an effective intervention: not all mentors who meet regularly with their mentees end up forming effective relationships with them and, further, it is not clear that such relationships facilitate positive outcomes. For this reason, we will also discuss those practices taking place in the one-to-one meetings that increase the likelihood that a genuine relationship will form between the two, and, in a subsequent chapter, the associated outcomes.

PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

In order to facilitate interactions between mentors and at-risk youth, college student mentoring programs must deal with a unique set of issues stemming from the fact that the mentors are college students operating in a setting whose primary purpose is to challenge and train them for the future. Further, they, like their mentees, are adolescents, in the final stages of the transition to adulthood. As a result, these programs have features not found in other mentoring programs. At issue, then, is how best to use the assets inherent in this situation to compensate for some of its inherent weaknesses.

Impediments

College mentors must balance two demanding and labor-intensive undertakings--their responsibilities as students and their responsibilities as mentors. When there is a conflict, however, there is rarely a question as to which responsibility takes precedence. As one student--who considered himself a dedicated mentor--said, "I'm a student and (academic) work is much more important to me than this." This reality makes it difficult for most college students to provide consistent and reliable support to an at-risk youth.

Mentors occasionally became frustrated when either the mentees or CPIL staff did not appreciate their academic obligations. One mentor stated:

> There was a time during finals when Charles would call and I [would say] I really can't talk now, and after I'd hang up the phone I was...damn I feel really bad, why did I do that. That month, month and a half period I felt like, excuse my French, S-H-I-T, you know the way I was coming off to

> him. I guess he didn't really understand...that [in college] you only have a couple tests during the year...I tried to explain that...[he has] one every Friday, and we only have one or two during the school year, and your grade is dependent on how well you do on those tests.

Another mentor expressed concern that program staff did not appreciate the time-intensive nature of the program, and the obstacles faced by college students as they attempted to integrate the mentoring program with their academic demands:

> Because it's hard to juggle, not only time but what's important to you. Because sometimes you do have to make choices. Like I have a paper due tomorrow, but I have my meeting tonight, so what am I supposed to do? And it's difficult to make those choices...And this program--I mean the work I've done this year has been really, really time-consuming, and the people who I work with in the program, like the adults, not the students, don't understand that I'm a student...Although this is important to me and I have a sense of dedication to it.

Further, college students who volunteer to become mentors are generally active people who participate in a wide range of other activities, both on and off campus. One mentor who also served as a student coordinator stated:

> I'm chairman of the Alcohol Policy...I'm also on Class Council, House Council...And I'm the manager of the Coffee Garden Cafe, which is this place. Also, I work in Dining Services and I work at the snack shop. Then I do the coordinating job...Yeah, I'm pretty involved. And I'm involved in the Alcohol and Drug education in school, I chair the organization, the committee for that.

In addition, some mentors have jobs. An extreme example is a mentor who was working 40 hours a week in addition to going to school full time. Another mentor took a job that required that he work 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. on weekends and 3 to 6 a.m. during the week.

When these pulls on mentors' time were complicated by logistical difficulties associated with mentoring, college students had even greater difficulty maintaining their commitment to the program. Two logistical problems--transportation and telephone communication--particularly affected the mentors' ability to meet with their mentees.

To a degree not characteristic of adult mentoring programs, transportation is a serious issue in college student mentoring programs. The at-risk youth being served rarely live in the neighborhoods in which the colleges are located. (In only one of the six CPIL programs studied was this the case.) Typically, the youth do not have ready access to transportation; thus, if the college student does not have the time or means to come to the mentee, contact is difficult.

One mentor responded to her transportation difficulties by arranging to see her mentee less frequently, but for a longer period; for example, they often spent entire weekends together. Such a heroic response, however, is a burden that few mentors would be willing or able to assume. Transportation, then, is a problem that mentoring programs must solve if the vital interactions between mentors and mentees are to take place.

Telephone communication can also be problematic. Mentors frequently reported that the mentees served by CPIL programs were very hard to reach by telephone. Telephone contact with youth is an essential part of most of these programs; in many cases, it is the only way to arrange meetings.[12] Also, some programs allow mentors to substitute telephone conversations for face-to-face interactions, and all suggested that mentors supplement face-to-face interaction with telephone conversations.

Mentors discovered early on that the mentees often did not have telephone service and that the service of those who did was frequently interrupted. For example, at the start of one program, six of 20 mentees either did not have telephone service or refused to provide their telephone number. Only four of the 20 mentees had the same telephone number at the end of the program as they did at the beginning.

As one mentor described it:

> A lot of the kids' phones are disconnected, their numbers are changed every other week. It's a problem getting in touch with them. And the school is not right around the corner from here, so going over there to visit them is a little bit difficult sometimes, especially if you don't know the (city) area.

Moreover, one call to the mentees was rarely sufficient to set up a meeting; some mentors reported that it was necessary to call twice--once to plan an activity and a second time to remind mentees of the time and place. Faced with this situation, some mentors backed off very early in the game. As one mentee described it:

> She called twice, but the first time she called I wasn't home. The second time she called, I was home and she said that we could try and get together. And she gave me her number but I didn't call her back. And then we didn't get to see each other.

---

[12]Many mentoring programs--among them several of the agencies in P/PV's 15-site evaluation of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America--will not accept youth who do not have telephones.

Frequency of Interaction

Under these circumstances--time pressures caused by academic demands, extracurricular activities or work, plus the logistical difficulties inherent in the circumstances of both the mentors and the mentees--it is perhaps not surprising that many of the pairs had difficulty meeting program requirements for personal interaction. In Table 4, we present data that allow us to examine the extent of mentor/mentee interaction, and the ways in which the programs attempted to support these meetings.

CPIL requirements for interaction between mentors and youth were fairly similar to those of other mentoring programs. For example, Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America requires that Big Brothers and Big Sisters meet with their charges for two to four hours a week; the Linking Lifetimes programs, which pair elder mentors with at-risk youth, require between four and 10 hours a week in one-to-one meetings. CPIL programs ask that mentors spend between two and four hours weekly in personal interaction with their mentees, partly in one-to-one meetings and partly in group activities. There were variations among sites in the ratio of required one-to-one and group activities.

One-to-One Activities. In three of the programs, participants were completely free to decide what they would do in their one-to-one meetings. The activities they typically selected included using college libraries or athletic facilities, attending movies or simply talking. In two other programs, the one-to-one interactions took place at the mentees' schools, and mentors generally spent between 30 and 50 percent of their time tutoring. In the remaining time, they could choose their own activities. The sixth program had few unstructured one-to-one sessions: one-to-one time was embedded in group activities, with participants spending one hour together discussing the theme of the group activity.

In the three of the five programs whose design included an academic component, it took the form of a youth's being tutored by the mentor. Invariably, these tutoring sessions took place during the time the program allocated for one-to-one interaction. Thus, there was a tradeoff: the more the pairs engaged in tutoring, the less time available for social and recreational activities, and vice versa. In programs not mandating tutoring, youth could anticipate spending most of their one-to-one time in recreational activities.

Group Activities. All programs supplemented one-to-one meetings with group activities, including:

- Recreational activities, such as swimming and ice-skating parties, as well as field trips to museums or nearby cities;
- Presentations on such practical issues as pregnancy prevention and AIDS education;

Table 4

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Component	Program 1	2	3	4	5	6
Required Weekly Contact	3 Hours	4 Hours	2.5 Hours[a]	2 Hours	3 Hours	3 Hours[b]
Type of In-Person Contact						
One-to-One	3 Hours/Wk	2 Hours/Wk	*	2 Hours/Wk	3 Hours/Wk	2 Meetings/ Month
Group	3 Meetings/ Year	2 Hours/Wk	2.5 Hours/Wk	1 Meeting/ Month	4 Meetings/ Year	2 Meetings/ Month
Attendance Rate	35-40%	80-90%	70%	95%	80-85%	35-40%
Mentor Meetings	No	Yes	Yes, Optional	Yes	Yes	No
Set Meeting Times	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Group Activities No, One-to-one
Transportation Plan	No	Campus Van	Campus Van	Private Car Required	Campus Car	No
Academic Component Mandated	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Some one-to-one interaction took place during each weekly session. There were occasional weeks that featured only one-to-one contact.

[a]Mentors were also required to call their mentee once a week.

[b]A telephone call could take the place of one hour of one-to-one time.

- Academic skills development sessions designed to integrate an academic component into the activities--for example, preparing newsletters or making presentations; and

- Team-building exercises, such as Ropes physical challenge courses.

Thus, groups of mentors and mentees took part in many of the same activities as individual pairs did in one-to-one meetings. A primary (and critical) difference is that if either member of a given pair failed to show up for a group activity, the other could still participate.

Across programs, there was wide variation in participant's attendance at required program events. When one-to-one meetings and group activities were combined, site variation in attendance ranged from 35 percent to 95 percent.[13] Moreover, since those figures measure average weekly attendance, they mask important facts. They underestimate the large numbers of youth (upward of 43 percent in the programs where we conducted face-to-face interviews with mentors and youth) who had met with their mentors only once or twice.

Factors Facilitating Increased Interaction

Table 4 also presents design features thought to be related to program success in facilitating a high rate of interaction between mentors and mentees. These data support the following generalization: given the unique circumstances inherent in a college mentoring program, programs that limit the number of decisions the individual college student must make and limit the amount of resources that the student is required to contribute are the most successful in helping mentors and youth get together, thereby setting the stage for the formation of constructive relationships.

In programs where mentors are expected to behave with virtual autonomy, they are responsible for arranging meetings with mentees. They must think of an activity; contact the mentee and get his or her agreement; come up with an agreed-on date and time; get tickets and/or make reservations, if necessary; and do whatever else is required to meet the mentee on the day of the activity, including arranging for transportation. Even when they go as planned, these activities take time. When logistical problems arise--as they often did--the mentor is left to work through them before even beginning to interact with the mentee. Programs that reduced or simplified this sequence--by establishing set meeting times, handling transportation and communication problems, and providing ongoing program training, support and supervision--were likely, on balance, to have a high rate of attendance.

---

[13]Attendance is defined as the average number of participants attending weekly program activities.

Meeting times. Establishing set meeting times was, perhaps, the most important of the factors affecting attendance rates. The four programs that established set meeting times for all program activities--both group activities and one-to-one interaction--had higher rates of attendance (70 to 95%) than the two programs that did not (35 to 40%). This was true regardless of the type of program or the specific location of the program activities.

Establishing a set meeting time--e.g., every Saturday afternoon not taken up on the academic calendar by mid-terms, finals, holidays or breaks--at the beginning of the academic year could serve two functions: it could help screen out mentors whose schedules are incompatible with program activities, and allow mentors to block out a period of time that can be held inviolate throughout the year.

Transportation. The CPIL programs studied dealt with transportation issues in a variety of ways. Two programs provided van transportation to bring the mentees to campus. Another program accepted only students who had access to a car; yet another provided cars to the mentors. In one program, the target agency was within walking distance of the college, though several mentors expressed safety concerns when traveling at night. The remaining program did not address the transportation issue at all.

The four programs that either provided transportation or required mentors to have transportation of their own had higher attendance than the two that did not. And programs that both set meeting times and made transportation easy for participants had the highest attendance rates; set meeting times also facilitated transportation arrangements, since the vans could follow a schedule, and the campus cars could be reserved for a specific time. The sites with the lowest attendance rates required the greatest effort on the part of mentors to arrange meetings, and did not provide transportation.

Supervision, support and in-program training. At least four of the CPIL programs provided mentors with in-program training sessions. Often referred to as "mentor meetings," these sessions were designed to provide mentors with supervision, support and in-program training. Mentors could discuss match-specific situations and get advice and feedback; program coordinators or project directors could monitor who was and was not meeting with their mentees and (if necessary) make new assignments; and mentors and staff could schedule presentations by professionals on topics relevant to mentoring. However, the programs' efforts at developing a consistent system of support were not generally successful, and attendance was low.

Mentors in programs not providing much support often reported feeling lost or abandoned:

> Mentor: Now in my eyes, I think the program is a bit unstructured, because you're asking about orientation and training, and I don't recall having any of these things. And as far as [the student coordinator] and I are

concerned, you know--as a matter of fact I just spoke to her last night--but they leave a lot up to the mentors as far as building the relationship. And I know that's what the program is about, but for one like me, who just joined it this year and had no training or orientation, it puts more of a strain on me, because here I am calling this girl whom I only met on one occasion...So I'm calling her and trying to establish a relationship over a telephone.

Mentor: [The program] introduces me to the girl and that's as far as it goes. I'm on my own now. We don't have a lot of things that we do together, we don't have a lot of planned activities together...I feel I'm on my own after I'm set up with my mentee.

The difficulties experienced by the mentors throughout the course of the program argue strongly for in-program mentor training and support sessions. As we discuss later, developing a relationship is a difficult and time-consuming process and mentors need advice on how to interact with their mentees.

Telephone Access. Overall, the programs studied were not successful in dealing with mentees' limited access to telephones. One program urged mentors to phone the mentees at school; in most instances, school staff allowed youth to leave class in order to talk.

THE HUMAN FACTOR

Program support notwithstanding, the essence of mentoring is the human interaction that occurs between the two individuals who are matched. In this section, we discuss some of the factors that distinguish the mentor/mentee pairs who formed successful relationships (13 of the 29, [45%]) and those who did not.[14] Of the pairs interviewed, some 35 percent met regularly, 22 percent met more infrequently, and 43 percent met only once or twice--if at all. Of the 57 percent of pairs meeting with some regularity, some--but not all--developed successful relationships.

When Mentors Are Unreliable

Mentees reported feelings of anger, hurt and disappointment when their mentors did not follow through on scheduled one-to-one meetings or failed to attend program activities.

---

[14]Data for this section come from in-depth interviews with 49 mentor/youth pairs in three of the six CPIL sites studied. Of the 49, a smaller analysis sample of 29 pairs was the subject of a rigorous content analysis, using the methodology developed to analyze the relationships formed between elders and youth in intergenerational mentoring programs (Styles and Morrow, 1992). (See Appendix B for a complete description of the methodology.)

When asked for her reaction to her mentor's absence from a program event, one mentee said, "I be angry, I be mad." Similarly, another indicated that the mentees get "all psyched-up" to see their mentors, and when they don't show up, the mentees get angry.

One youth, when asked the reasons for her disappointment with the program, said: "Because she don't call me and she don't take me on a trip like she be saying."

> Interviewer: Okay, is that kind of disappointing for you? Were you expecting that you would get to go places with her?
> Youth: Yes
> Interviewer: Where would you like to go?
> Youth: I'd like to go to the shore and to the skating rink.
> Interviewer: Did you ever tell her that, did you ever say I wish we could go to these places or do these things?
> Youth: No.
> Interviewer: No? How come?
> Youth: Because I be scared.
> Interviewer: Scared of what?
> Youth: That she might say no.

Group activities sometimes compensated for absent mentors. One youth reported enjoying a pizza party even though his mentor did not attend. Asked whether he liked the program, he said, "Yeah, the program is good, but I don't know about the mentors." At other times, attending group meetings alone exacerbated mentees' feelings of abandonment, particularly when they saw other youth having a good time with their mentors. As a result, some mentees indicated a desire for reassignment. One mentee was interested in a particular student as a new mentor "because she looks like she can spend time with you."

Relationships Among Pairs That Meet Regularly

As it evolves, the developing relationship between the mentor and the mentee comes up against numerous issues, choice points and decisions that must be successfully negotiated. How the mentor responds at each of these points is critical, determining whether the relationship will proceed smoothly, with difficulty, or not at all.

Although the mentor is the senior partner in the relationship, the mentee is not without power. Participation is voluntary and a youth who is not satisfied can simply stop attending. Thus, getting the mentee on board--that is, garnering his or her satisfaction--is the single most important challenge the mentor faces. To do that, and lay the foundation for an effective relationship, the mentor must weather the difficult early stages of the relationship and solicit the youth's preferences; based on these preferences, develop a satisfactory set of activities for them to pursue in their one-to-one meetings; and assume a

role, or set of roles, that capitalizes on age proximity yet permits the exercise of the guidance function that is the hallmark of being a mentor.

Combatting Initial Reticence. As was the case with the relationships formed between elders and at-risk youth in the intergenerational programs in the Linking Lifetimes initiative (Styles and Morrow, 1992), initial meetings between mentors and mentees in the CPIL programs could be extremely challenging. Getting the mentees past the early, barely communicative stage of shrugs and monosyllabic responses was a difficult, time-consuming process. Getting them to express their desires and preferences for the relationship with the mentor required even greater patience and skill.

Taking Into Account Mentees' Preferences. Many mentors were confused by the lack of communication, and assumed that silence meant that the mentee had no preferences they need consider. As a result, they proceeded to develop plans that took no account of the mentees' wishes. On the other hand, successful mentors used a process of trial and error to survive this period--both developing suggestions of their own for joint activities and attempting to follow up on the relatively few clues the youth did give them.

These mentors incorporated what they were able to learn of the youth's preferences into their plans. As a result, mentees felt more invested in the program, and appeared to get more out of the activities. As one mentee said of her mentor:

> She's fun. She does a lot of things that I like to do. You know, she asks me what I want to do. She doesn't plan things for us, she checks if I like it, and if I don't like it, then...she finds more than one thing to do in case I don't want that one thing.

Mentees had strong negative reactions to activities in which they had no interest, and often found clever ways to avoid them. One mentee made a practice of bringing his friends along once he realized that the mentor stopped engaging in "boring talk" when there were other people around. This mentee said, "Most of the time my brother comes and Michael; (otherwise) I don't go because it's going to be boring."

At other times, mentees boycotted or walked out on activities in which they did not want to participate. Like many others, one youth simply did not attend activities he did not like: "When they have group and the lady sits there and talks and talks and talks, and they start talking and you get tired and you leave."

What the mentees did find engaging--simply put--was fun. Unfortunately, many mentors were inclined to discount mentees' interest in going to the movies, playing football or swimming because they regarded such activities as frivolous. Successful mentors, however, learned to work with their mentees' desire for fun, recognizing that failure to do so might lead to a premature end to the relationship and provide no further opportunity to work with the youth in areas they felt were more important.

Having fun with their mentors was of intrinsic value to the mentees, since many had difficult lives that permitted them few opportunities to enjoy themselves in a safe and carefree environment. It was also valuable for what it signified--that the mentor cared for the mentee and was willing to do something for no reason other than to please the youth. One mentee expressed his feelings:

> Interviewer: When did you start to figure out that he liked you?
> Youth: When he started telling me that he was going to take me to a lot of places.
> Interviewer: Then you knew he liked you?
> Youth: Yes.

Another mentee reported her reaction after she and her mentor jointly decided which movie to see:

> Interviewer: So what did you like about that time, what was special about going to the movies with [her] that time?
> Youth: At least I knew that she was willing to take me somewhere [I wanted to go].

Further, there is clear evidence that "having fun" is a crucial phase in the establishment of trust. Mentors who had fun with their mentees, took them to places of their choosing, and more generally respected their preferences, paved the way for more instrumental activities at a later stage in the relationship.

Nevertheless, mentors struggled with this. One summed up the dilemma:

> It was kind of a chaotic kind of experience, but they were expressing their dissatisfaction with the program and how we never let them do what they want, and that they were bored, and they wanted to go home, and they didn't want to be in the program anymore.
>
> Why? Well, when we tried to do anything that had to do with any type of work, any type of thinking, they thought it was too much like school. We always got the comment [that] you never ask us what we want to do, which was really erroneous because I mean when they asked us to go swimming, we tried to get the pool. We went figure skating, we did a lot of the things that they wanted to do. And to a certain extent, they didn't really understand that this wasn't a program--I know I sound harsh--but it really wasn't a program designed to make them have fun every Tuesday. It had other goals, to be perfectly honest. And it wasn't like we would say, "by the way, you're at risk, so this is why we're doing this." But in the back of our heads, we had to kind of keep in mind that this isn't supposed to be like

paradise. You're supposed to learn a few things here while we're having fun.

One pair handled this issue by agreeing to have "fun" once a week and do more "serious" work once a week.

Finding an Appropriate Role. As should be apparent from the preceding discussion, mentors experienced confusion regarding the appropriate role to assume in their interactions with mentees. On the one hand, both mentors and mentees are adolescents and, to some degree, share concerns about school, parents, dating and other aspects of being young. A relationship in which the college student relates to the mentee as an older sibling or peer thus seems feasible. And, indeed, there is ample evidence that mentees responded positively when mentors treated them as peers. The following discussion gives a sense of successful peer dynamics:

> Youth: About boys, how they can be, we were talking about that, how they treat other girls or something. That was one of the conversations that we had, that was one of the best conversations we had.
> Interviewer: And you remember that conversation because, or that was a good conversation because...?
> Youth: Because like we had the same problems with boys and guys. Like it seems like they're all the same in the way they treat us.
> Interviewer: So you were kind of surprised to hear that she had some of the same experiences that maybe you had?
> Youth: Yeah, same things that go on...It didn't really surprise me, but I don't know, I don't know how to explain it. It wasn't surprising to me, but I knew we probably shared something the same that happened with me to her, whatever...[She's] kind of like a sister and a friend at the same time. Because the way she treats me and how we talk and everything. We're kind of close, real close, and we keep secrets to each other and we tell each other different things and everything. And she doesn't tell anybody what I tell her and I don't tell anybody else what she tells me, about what she does.

Sometimes the mentors themselves enjoyed the benefits of a more peer-oriented relationship. One mentor reported feeling "like I'm 13 again--and when he gets grounded, I'm punished too. I can't see him." Another mentor enjoyed his mentee's sense of humor and the late night phone calls that would leave him laughing.

Alternatively, as the following exchange illustrates, mentees had strong negative reactions when mentors took an authoritarian stance or failed to demonstrate that they were clearly the mentees' ally. One youth reported that his mentor was:

> Always saying I'm doing something wrong...When I be doing something good, he thinks I'm doing something bad. When I was doing my work, he gonna say I ain't doing my work...I was doing what I was supposed to do-...my teacher knows I was doing my work...He said he gonna tell the people to expel me because he said that I was going to fight a girl in the class, and I won't fight no girl...Me and him would talk in the back of our classroom and he said that I wasn't doing my work and all that.

This youth eventually dropped out of the program. He would show up occasionally for group activities, but would refuse to speak to the mentor.

Under these circumstances, mentors found it very difficult to incorporate tutoring into their interactions. This was particularly true for programs where tutoring was not a part of mentees' initial expectations: either it was not mandated by the program, or it was not given adequate attention in the youth's orientation to the program. As one mentee described it: "One time, he come to get me and he be asking me all these problems, like how many ounces in a quart and all that. And I be knowing, and he keeps on asking me and stuff--I be mad." Another mentee reported that his mentor reminded him of a teacher: "[He] talks too much...he's always talking about schoolwork...and it's boring." Academic instruction in these circumstances not only fails to achieve the instrumental goal, but serves as a barrier to the development of a relationship.

Mentees showed some willingness to participate in tutoring when it was presented as part of an overall plan to support them. This mentee had a positive experience with academic assistance from his mentor:

> The social studies teacher told him I was having a couple of problems, and he asked me what was wrong. And I told him, and he said he don't like social studies or science either, but you still have to do them. And so he helped me like with some of the work. And he told me even if I don't like it, I still have to do it. And now I do better in it, because I used to hate it because the teacher always yelled...He showed me how to do this thing she asked me to do, and I did it and I got most of the stuff right. Then I just started getting better, and he came and looked and see what I was doing. And I was doing my homework, and he said when she yells, just don't pay her no mind. And I didn't, I just kept doing my work.

On balance, mentors in relationships that mentees found most satisfactory learned to play a variety of roles, skillfully maneuvering among them as dictated by changes in the situation or in the mentees' needs. For instance, a mentor might relate to the mentee as a peer when choosing the activities the pair would pursue, and as a teacher or coach when the youth clearly required guidance. One mentor discussed the various roles he plays with his mentee:

> One situation where I feel like an older brother or just, you know, like a really really really close friend...[is] going to the arcade. I mean my father never did that with me...Charles and I, you know, went to the arcade and I played him, I played a game with him that I was very good at and he was okay, and you know it was this game called Street Fighter II, where you pick all these different characters. I was describing it to him on the phone and he says hey, that seems like a really cool game. And I picked this guy, he's like a marine, and he picked this guy from India who is like a witch doctor and his arms stretch about, I don't know, about five feet, and, you know, we were fighting each other; of course, I won.
>
> A situation where I felt like an uncle or a father figure, I'd say, was the time Charles called me late at night and there was TV on in the background and I said, "Charles why aren't you in bed?"

Other mentors shared similar confusion about their roles:

> She just said that she had left her homework at home, her teacher had to go so she had to do it after school and that like it wasn't a big deal. And it was hard to know if it really wasn't a big deal or if it was. So I just tried to emphasize the need to do her homework, and told her that she should do her homework in one place all the time so that she would put her homework in her book bag after she did it and it would just be there in the morning. Because she said that she forgot to bring it to school.
>
> It's hard, when we have those kind of conversations. Normally, it's very important for me to keep a friendship type of thing between us, and for me not to be an authority figure to her. I think when I start talking to her like that, she tunes me out, because I think she just decides, "Oh, she's yelling at me."

SUMMARY

Although the essence of mentoring is the human interaction between two individuals, a mentoring intervention nevertheless requires an undergirding of program support. This is particularly true when the mentor is a college student juggling the rigors of being a mentor for an at-risk youth with the responsibilities of college--academic requirements, extracurricular activities and, occasionally, part-time employment.

In the programs studied, this balancing act proved impossible for many students. Across sites, substantial numbers of mentors met with their middle school mentees only once or twice (if at all) during their yearlong commitment. When this happened, the effect was sobering: youth whose mentors did not follow through on their commitments spoke eloquently of their feelings of anger and abandonment.

Among programs, however, there was wide variation in the degree to which mentor/youth interactions took place as scheduled. Programs that most strongly supported and facilitated the individual mentors' efforts--particularly by establishing a set schedule of meeting times and by providing reliable transportation--had higher rates of interaction than those that did not.

In-depth interviews with pairs of mentors and youth suggest that 45 percent form successful relationships, when success is defined as the sum of a youth's satisfaction with both the mentor and the relationship, the duration of the relationship, and the youth's desire that it continue. Mentors in successful relationships responded to the numerous choice points that occurred over the course of their development by selecting the option most likely to garner the youth's satisfaction. That is, they allowed the relationships to be youth-driven--taking into account the youth's clear preference for the social and recreational activities that were seen as a necessary precursor to the possibility of engaging youth in tutoring or other academically oriented activities. This meant a certain degree of role flexibility--knowing when to be something akin to a peer or older sibling and when to take on the role of a teacher or coach.

IV. COLLEGE STUDENT AND MENTEE OUTCOMES

Since CPIL program staff expected both mentees and mentors to benefit from participation, it was important to examine the programs' ability and potential to engender important and durable effects on the participants.

Staff focused on achieving the following outcomes for the mentees: greater exposure to cultural, social and recreational opportunities; increased self-esteem; improved academic performance; and reduced antisocial behavior.

Program staff expected to develop the college students' leadership skills, sense of community and sense that they can make a difference in the world. In addition to their stated goals, previous research (Reisner et al., 1989) suggested that the experience of serving as a mentor might improve the mentors' self-esteem and communication and relationship skills. Since these are college students, it was expected that the experience of serving as a mentor might also improve their GPAs. Given the paucity of information regarding the effect that serving as a mentor has on college students, this report examines several potential outcomes ranging from those expected by CPIL program staff to those viewed as possibilities by others in the mentoring field.[15]

METHODS

To detect changes in attitudes and behaviors among both youth and college student mentors that may have resulted from participation in the program, a pre/posttest research design was used. Data were collected through the administration of baseline and follow-up questionnaires to both youth and mentors at Boston University, Connecticut College and Xavier University; and to the mentors at Georgetown University, Porterville Community College and West Virginia Wesleyan College.[16] The baseline questionnaires included background and demographic information as well as measures of attitudes, perceptions and behaviors.[17] These baseline data provide descriptive information on both the youth and the college students participating in the programs.

Since participants were required to commit to the program for an academic year, the follow-up questionnaires were administered late in Spring 1991, near the conclusion of their participation. Items used to measure attitudes, perceptions and behavior at baseline were repeated so that changes could be detected. In addition, these instruments

---

[15]We could not locate acceptable measures of leadership skills or sense of community for college student mentors.

[16]No Boston University mentors completed the follow-up questionnaire.

[17]See Appendix B for a complete discussion of the technical and methodological issues associated with data collection.

collected information on the activities the pairs participated in over the year, and mentors' and mentees' perceptions of the program--both favorable and unfavorable.

In reviewing the outcomes data, one must remember that the results reflect only the change (or lack of change) in an outcome from baseline to follow-up. Since there is no comparison or control group, the change cannot definitively be attributed to the program; for example, changes could be due simply to maturation.

MENTOR OUTCOMES

The low overall response rate of mentors to the follow-up survey (59.5%) makes the mentor data less reliable than the mentee data. The low response rate suggests that mentors who had positive experiences in the program may be overrepresented in the sample. This overrepresentation would increase the likelihood that the results will be skewed in a positive direction.

Attitudinal and Behavioral Measures

In evaluating potential outcomes for mentors, measures of self-concept, self-esteem, powerlessness, quality of peer and family relationships, and communication behaviors were examined. Five scales developed by Neemann and Harter (1986) to measure aspects of self-concept were employed: a global measure of self-worth, and four domain-specific scales--scholastic competence, social acceptance, parental relationships and close friendships.

Global self-worth taps the extent to which college students like themselves and are happy with the way they are leading their lives. Scholastic competence taps the students' perceptions of their own competence or ability within the realm of scholastic performance. The social acceptance scale measures the mentors' satisfaction with their social skills. Parental relationships examines the degree to which college students feel comfortable with the way they act around their parents and get along with them. Close friendships examines their ability to make close friends with whom personal thoughts and secrets can be shared. In addition to the global self-worth and the four domain-specific aspects of self-concept, a unidimensional measure of self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1979) was included.

To measure whether the mentors thought that they could effect changes at the societal level, a powerlessness scale was included (Neal and Seeman, 1964).[18] This powerlessness scale focuses on a person's perception of whether they can influence the outcome of political and economic events. Persons with high powerlessness believe they have little

[18]Two modifications were made to the original scale. One item was changed by replacing the word "inflation" with "recession," due to the economic climate during the 1990-91 academic year. In addition, the original forced-choice response format was changed to a four-point Likert scale.

influence over world events, while those with low powerlessness believe they can make a difference in the outcome of these events.

Communication is a key component of the mentoring dynamic. The experience of serving as a mentor should improve the college students' communication skills. In measuring these communication skills and behaviors, three scales developed by Spitzberg (1988)--social confirmation, social experience and appropriate disclosure--were used. Social confirmation taps the respondents' attempts to make the "other person" feel good or important. Social experience measures their ability to interact well with new people and their exposure to different social groups. The appropriate disclosure scale measures respondents' awareness of the degree of intimacy of their own and others' disclosures.

Results

Mentors' self-esteem, perceived scholastic competence and social acceptance (Table 5) all improved significantly.[19] The increase in perceived scholastic competence, however, did not translate into an improvement in GPA. Since the mentors had only received one set of grades since beginning program participation, it is likely that insufficient time had elapsed for such a change to occur. The increase in self-esteem was not corroborated by an increase in self-worth. There was no change in the powerlessness scale nor in the mentors' communication skills.

It seems that the programs have the potential to affect the mentors on a personal level, as suggested by the improvements in the self-esteem scale and in two domain-specific aspects of self-concept (scholastic competence and social acceptance). However, the programs did not seem to make the college students feel more empowered to change the world. It is possible that the experience of serving as a mentor improved the mentors' personal skills (social acceptance, self-esteem) but that their first-hand exposure to the difficult conditions of disadvantaged youth did not make them feel empowered to make changes at the societal level.

MENTEE OUTCOMES

Data for the mentee outcomes study were collected at only three programs; as such, they cannot be considered representative of all mentees participating in a campus-based mentoring program. Also, outcomes are examined only for the overall sample; the sample size is not sufficient to conduct any subgroup analyses. However, the data do offer useful insights into the potential outcomes.

The results are mixed; youth exhibited a statistically significant improvement in their sense that events in their lives are contingent on their actions, and in their exposure to a

[19]Given the response rate, all results given here should be interpreted cautiously.

Table 5

MENTOR BASELINE AND CHANGE FROM BASELINE SCORES
ON SELF-CONCEPT, COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS
AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES, AND IN GPA

SCALE	BASELINE	CHANGE FROM BASELINE
SELF-CONCEPT		
Global Self-Worth[a]	20.5	0.6
Scholastic Competence[b]	11.8	0.9***
Social Acceptance[b]	13.1	0.9**
Parental Relationships[b]	13.8	0.3
Close Relationships[b]	13.8	0.5
Self-Esteem[c]	34.9	1.8***
COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS		
Social Confirmation[d]	21.7	- 0.1
Social Experience[d]	20.8	0.4
Appropriate Disclosure[d]	19.4	0.6
Powerlessness[e]	14.4	- 0.1
GPA	3.1	- 0.07
Sample Size	50	50

**Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .05 level of significance.
***Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .01 level of significance.

[a]Scores can range from 6 to 24.
[b]Scores can range from 4 to 16.
[c]Scores can range from 10 to 40.
[d]Scores can range from 5 to 25.
[e]Scores can range from 7 to 28.

greater number of social and cultural activities. However, there were no reported behavioral changes nor improvements in academic performance.

Attitudinal and Behavioral Measures

In evaluating the potential outcomes for the mentees, five social psychological measures of self-concept, locus of control and social support were used. Three of Harter's (1985) measures tapping aspects of self-concept were included: a measure of global self-worth, and two domain-specific scales--social acceptance and scholastic competence.[20] The global self-worth and scholastic competence scales are similar to the college student scales described earlier in this chapter, with only wording changes incorporated to accommodate the younger age group. Social acceptance measures the degree to which the child feels popular or accepted by peers.

The mentees' sense that they have control over the events in their lives was measured using the Nowicki and Strickland (1973) locus of control scale. This scale measures respondents' belief that the events in their lives are contingent on their actions, not controlled by external forces beyond their control.

A scale measuring social support was included in the analysis. An ideal mentor would provide caring and consistent support to a youth. The degree to which this affects the youth's social support network depends on the mentor's place in it. If the youth has a reasonably well-developed support network, a mentor would fill a complementary role with less chance of causing a significant change in the network. If the youth does not have a solid social support network, a mentor would fill a compensatory role and bring an increased chance for change.

Results

As shown in Table 6, the programs were successful in exposing the mentees to greater social, cultural and recreational opportunities. At follow-up, almost 60 percent (59.6%) of the mentees reported having increased their visits to a college; 44.3 percent reported an increase in the number of times they had ever attended a professional or college sporting event; 40 percent reported increased visits to a museum; and 34.7 percent reported increased visits to a library outside of their school.

It is not surprising that mentees visited a college more frequently, given that college students are the mentors. However, since many mentors and program staff voiced a desire to have the mentees view attending college as possible, increasing the mentees' exposure to college should be considered an achievement.

---

[20]Harter actually developed six scales for youth in this age range. Only the three scales most relevant to the CPIL model were used, since including the three additional scales (18 questions) would have increased the respondent burden to an unacceptable level.

Table 6

CULTURAL AND SOCIAL ENRICHMENT
ACTIVITIES FOR MENTEES

ACTIVITY	BASELINE MEAN SCORE[a]	PERCENTAGE REPORTING AN INCREASE
Visited a college	0.9	59.6***
Gone to a professional or college sporting event	0.8	44.3**
Visited a museum	1.5	40.0**
Gone to a library outside of school	1.5	34.7**
Gone to a professional dance performance like a ballet or modern dance concert	0.7	36.7
Gone to a music concert	1.1	28.0
Read a book from beginning to end that was not related to schoolwork	1.6	26.9
Gone to a play	1.7	20.4
Sample Size	52[b]	

**Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .05 level of significance.
***Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .01 level of significance.

[a]Response Categories:
0 = Never
1 = Once or Twice
2 = Three to Five times
3 = Six or More times

[b]The sample size for specific activities ranges from 49 to 52. Since the potential overall sample size was small (52), these single variable outcomes were analyzed with fewer than 52 cases rather than analyzing only those cases with no missing data on all outcomes variables.

Some combination of participants' interest in an activity, their access to it, the cost and program organization of the event likely influenced which activities showed a statistically significant gain. Given the time demands on college students, it is far more likely that they attended a readily accessed on-campus event. Similarly, college students with little money were more likely to take their mentee to events that have small or no admission charges.

Intuitively, there would seem to be positive effects from exposing mentees to new cultural, social and recreational opportunities. However, while our data show that programs were successful in exposing the mentees to such opportunities, they do not allow us to state if the exposure had a long-term effect.

Although there was no change over the year in the global self-worth, social acceptance, scholastic competence or social support scales--as shown in Table 7--there was a statistically significant change in the locus of control scale. Mentees' mean score dropped 1.2 points (from 10.7 to 9.5), indicating that they felt more in control of their personal lives.

In comparing mentees' behavior during the current academic year (1990-91) to their behavior in the previous academic year, there was no significant improvement in any of the nine behaviors being studied (Table 8). However, there was a significant decrease in the numbers of mentees (44.2%) receiving awards. This result is probably more an artifact of the time at which data were collected than an actual decline. Most school awards are presented at the end of the year; since the follow-up questionnaire was administered six to eight weeks before the end of the school year, the decline is not surprising.

The three programs for which we examined mentee outcomes did not emphasize tutoring nor focus on behavior-related outcomes, so it is not surprising that we found no significant positive effects. Also, the timing of the data collection likely made it difficult to capture a change. For example, suppose a mentee reported being sent to the principal's office six or more times during the 1990-91 academic year. If five of those six episodes occurred before November, the follow-up survey, which compared only year-to-year changes, would not have picked up the within-year improvement.

OUTCOMES SUMMARY

The mentors exhibited improvements in self-esteem, and perceived scholastic competence and social acceptance, but did not show improvements in communication skills, GPA or powerlessness--i.e., their sense that they can change the world. These outcomes must be interpreted cautiously, however, given the low follow-up response rate.

Over the course of the program, the mentees were exposed to additional social and cultural activities, and their sense of control over their lives improved, but there were no behavioral changes or improvements in academic performance.

Table 7

MENTEE BASELINE AND CHANGE FROM BASELINE SCORES
ON SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL AND SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALES

SCALE	BASELINE	CHANGE FROM BASELINE
SELF-CONCEPT		
Scholastic Competence[a]	15.5	0.4
Social Acceptance[a]	17.0	0.6
Global Self-Worth[a]	18.4	0.7
Locus of Control[b]	10.7	-1.2***
Social Support[c]	34.9	1.5
Sample Size	52	52

***Indicates that the change is statistically different from zero at the .01 level of significance.

[a]Scores can range from 6 to 24.
[b]Scores can range from 0 to 21.
[c]Scores can range from 12 to 48.

Table 8

COMPARISON OF MENTEE ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91 VS. SCHOOL YEAR 1989-90

BEHAVIOR	BASELINE MEAN SCORE[a]	PERCENTAGE SHOWING AN IMPROVEMENT
Skipped a class	0.3	3.8
Skipped a day of school	0.7	23.1
Tried out for a school activity like a sports team, a play or the choir	1.3	23.1
Got sent to the principal's office for doing something wrong	0.8	19.2
Joined a school club or committee	0.7	19.2
Received an award or honor for things like academic achievement, athletic achievement or good conduct	1.5	17.3[b]
Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you	0.5	28.8
Stole or tried to steal something	0.4	19.6
Cheated on a school test	0.4	13.5
Sample Size	52[c]	

[a]Response Categories:
0 = Never
1 = Once or Twice
2 = Three to Five Times
3 = Six or More Times

[b]Although some youth reported receiving more awards, a significant number of youth--44.2%--reported receiving fewer awards.

[c]The sample size for specific behaviors is either 51 or 52. Since the potential overall sample size was small (52), these single variable outcomes were analyzed with fewer than 52 cases rather than analyzing only those cases with no missing data on all outcomes variables.

Again, these results must be viewed cautiously. Several factors--inconsistently implemented programs, a small sample, high sample attrition and the lack of a comparison group--all make it less likely that the research could demonstrate definitively that participation in a campus-based mentoring program has an effect on college students or mentees. Definitive statements would require a larger and summative study.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implementation of the CPIL model varied significantly across the six CPIL sites examined during the 1990-91 academic year. They varied in the type of meetings held between mentors and mentees (group or one-to-one) and their location (campus, mentees' school or elsewhere). Programs also varied in the type of target agencies (school or housing project), size (from eight to 24 matches), school grade levels across the target population (fourth through ninth grades), and time budgeted for the program directors (from four to 30 hours). Also, attendance rates (measuring average weekly attendance) ranged widely across the six programs--from 35 percent to 95 percent.

The exploratory nature of the quantitative outcomes study and the methodological cautions noted in Chapter IV make it inappropriate to correlate program approaches and outcomes data. However, it is possible to correlate programmatic aspects and styles of interaction with attendance rates and quality of matches. We also identified seemingly effective programmatic responses to recurring areas of difficulty for programs. Below, we summarize the correlations that were observed and suggest programmatic approaches that appear to produce the most positive results.

PROGRAM STAFFING

In general, the more time the director or other professional staff person spent on the program, the more successful the program was in terms of attendance and quality of matches.

Program directors are members of the college's professional staff, usually with experience in the community service field. They are given both operational responsibilities (e.g., recruiting, screening) and social work and pedagogical ones (e.g., reviewing match-specific issues and developing a case plan for each match). Programs also have student coordinators, who execute the program under the direction of the program director. Student coordinators are particularly useful for such operational tasks as carrying out recruitment campaigns and driving vans, but are not experienced enough to provide match-specific advice.

Staff efforts are directed primarily at the mentors: mentors are screened and trained, have support groups, receive supervision and advice from program staff, and know with whom to speak in the event of problems. In contrast, youth receive very little direct attention from program staff. No one is designated to represent mentees' needs and interests, or respond to their problems.

Recommendations. While we cannot definitively state the amount of time a program director should spend to make these programs effective, our best estimate is that for a 20-pair program, 20 hours per week is probably the minimum. One program director even thought that insufficient: "It's hard to be a part-time brain surgeon," he said.

In addition, we believe that, depending on their professional training, program directors may benefit from the help of an assistant director or outside counselor familiar with relationship formation and adolescent development issues.

Further, we believe that the likelihood that pairs will meet and mentees will benefit would increase with the addition of a staff person to function as an advocate for the mentees--someone with knowledge of the youth, access to program staff and authority to resolve problems that arise. In our view, the mentees' representative would play a critical role in the program. This role--effectively implemented--would make the program more responsive to the youth's needs, meaning that the program would be run as much for the mentees as for the college students. The representative, by focusing on the mentees' interests, would increase the likelihood that youth will have positive experiences in the program.

PROGRAM PREPARATION

Mentor and Mentee Recruitment

The research provides little new information regarding effective mentor recruitment techniques. It does show, however, that programs have a far easier time recruiting female mentors than male mentors.

The most common strategy for recruiting mentees--targeting all youth in either a housing project or a school--does not appear suitable, since it does not necessarily produce a match between the type of youth referred and program goals.

Recommendation. More successful matches are likely if program staff tie the youth referral process to the nature of the program. For example, if a program has a primarily academic focus, program staff should work to refer youth who want and need that kind of assistance.

Screening

Programs that rigorously screened their mentors by requiring them to demonstrate an understanding of and commitment to the program had higher attendance rates than those that did not.

Recommendation. We suggest that programs conduct rigorous screening that includes explaining to potential mentors the extensive commitment they are making, discussing the difficulties associated with developing a relationship with a disadvantaged 10- to 15-year-old, and asking students to define how they will fit the program into their schedules.

Mentor Training

Taken as a group, the programs offered pre-match training on program structure and expectations, information on the life circumstances of each youth, descriptions of their community, and characterizations of situations that may occur during the mentoring relationship. Programs that offered more extensive training tended to have better matches. In programs with less extensive training, mentors frequently expressed the desire for more help.

Recommendations. Programs could increase the number of successful matches by offering a more comprehensive pre-match training program. While it is not possible to put together an all-inclusive pre-match training agenda, our interviews with staff and participants suggest that at the conclusion of initial training, mentors should understand:

- Personal background information on their mentee and the nature of his or her neighborhood (perhaps using a community representative);
- Program rules: what is expected of mentors and mentees in terms of behavior and attendance;
- That the improper exercise of authority will seriously impede the development of a peer relationship between the pair;
- That one intervention--the mentoring program--cannot turn a youth's life around;
- That the beginning of the relationship requires the patient building of trust and is facilitated by having fun and expressing an interest in the youth's preferences; and
- That scheduling recreational activities fills an important need by allowing mentees to participate in activities in which they do not normally participate.

Mentee Training

The programs offered mentees orientation sessions only; there was no formal pre-match training. During these orientation sessions, staff emphasized rules and regulations that, in our view, made the program sound more like school than a mentoring program. While a discussion of program rules is important, our interviews showed that some mentees' expectations of the program were not in line with what the program actually offered.

Recommendation. Training for mentees should consist of:

- Specific explanations of what mentees will be doing in the program;

- A review of what is expected of both mentees and mentors in terms of behavior and attendance;

- An introduction to the mentees' representative, the person they will talk to if they have problems with their mentor or other program staff; and

- An explanation that mentors may not be available during their breaks and exams, thus mitigating some of the frustration that can result from the mentors' absence.

POST-MATCH ISSUES

It is the responsibility of program staff to put in place program supports that can increase the probability that mentors and youth will meet, the prerequisite for relationship formation. Attendance is a particular concern with regard to college students, who face time constraints from academic requirements, extracurricular activities and jobs.

Among the study sites, the programs that limited both the number of decisions the individual college student had to make and the resources he or she was required to contribute were most successful in assisting mentors and youth in getting together. However, regular meetings alone do not ensure that a successful relationship will develop. Successful relationships are youth-driven--that is, mentors respect the youth's clear preference for engaging in enjoyable activities, using them as a building block to establish the trust that could later set the stage for tutoring or other instrumental activities that, in turn, could lead to positive outcomes.

Recommendations. Establishing set meeting times reduces the possibility that the mentoring program will get lost in the shuffle of college students' many activities. This does not eliminate flexibility in the mentor/mentee interaction, since the programs need only structure the timing, not the content, of the interactions.

Eliminating logistical obstacles, such as transportation, also increases the likelihood that participants will meet. Programs can respond to the transportation issue differently, but they must address it. Local conditions, such as the location of the target agency relative to the campus, and the availability of resources (e.g., a campus van) will affect a program's response.

More regular, extensive and mandatory in-program training sessions for mentors offer the opportunity to apply previously presented abstract concepts to actual situations, monitor attendance and offer mentors match-specific advice on effective ways to interact with their mentees, including by scheduling recreational activities. A professional familiar with the needs of disadvantaged youth and the abilities of college students is the most appropriate person to facilitate these sessions, as well as to provide match-specific guidance to mentors in the course of building relationships.

CONCLUSION

Since this study is a formative rather than summative evaluation, many questions about college student mentoring programs remain. Campus-based mentoring programs are still in a relatively nascent state and this report has presented several suggestions for improving their implementation. Future research should focus on confirming these recommendations and examining the effect of service on recipients, as well as documenting the service experience of college students.

College students did form successful relationships, but in fewer than half the matches (45%) that were made. (This compares with the two-thirds recorded by similar P/PV studies of elder mentoring programs [Freedman, 1988; Styles and Morrow, 1992], and the one-third estimated in an informal survey of program operators recruiting mentors of all ages [Freedman, 1992].) CPIL's average attendance rates were below 50 percent at two sites and reached only 70 percent at a third. These problems partially reflect operational difficulties that stemmed from the newness of the programs and the directors' inexperience in running them.

The problems, however, extend beyond operational difficulties. College students had difficulty integrating the program into their schedules. Mentoring is time-consuming; failure to make it a top priority will likely result in a failed relationship. College students commit to the program for an academic year, restricting their participation in other activities during that time. Mentors should understand that their effective participation requires bending other activities around the mentoring program.

It is worth noting that the difficulties described here regarding the ability of college students to manage the programs and serve as mentors are not a reflection of their interest in or dedication to improving the situation of disadvantaged youth. Serving as a mentor is difficult. In their own words, it is a "learning" experience for them. As learners, they need adults to guide and instruct them in their interactions with the young mentees.

REFERENCES

Freedman, Marc
1988 Partners in Growth: Elder Mentors and At-Risk Youth. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Freedman, Marc
1992 The Kindness of Strangers: Reflections on the Mentoring Movement. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Harter, Susan
1985 Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for Children. Denver: University of Denver.

Neal, A., and M. Seeman
1964 "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis." American Sociological Review, 29:216-225.

Neemann, Jennifer, and Susan Harter
1986 Manual for the Self-Perception Profile for College Students. Denver: University of Denver.

Nowicki Jr., S., and B. R. Strickland
1973 "A Locus of Control Scale for Children." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40:148-154.

Oden, Sherri, Mario A. Kelley, Zhenkui Ma, and David P. Weikart
1992 Challenging the Potential: Programs for Disadvantaged Youth. Ypsilanti MI: High/Scope Press.

Ogbu, J. U.
1986 "The Consequences of the American Caste System," in Neisser, U., ed., The School Achievement of Minority Children: New Perspectives. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Reisner, Elizabeth R., Christene A. Petry, and Michele Armitage
1989 A Review of Programs Involving College Students as Tutors or Mentors in Grades K-12. Washington D.C.: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

Robinson, John P., Phillip R. Shaver, and Lawrence S. Wrightsman, eds.
1991 Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes. San Diego: Academic Press.

Rosenberg, M.
1979 Conceiving the Self. New York: Basic Books.

Serow, Robert C.
1991 "Students and Voluntarism: Looking Into the Motive of Community Service Participants." American Educational Research Journal, 28:543-556.

Spitzberg, Brian
1988 "Communication Competence: Measures of Perceived Effectiveness," in Tarry, Charles, ed., A Handbook for the Study of Human Communication. Norwood NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Steinberg, Laurence
1991 "The Logic of Adolescence," in Edelman, O. and J. Ladner, eds., Adolescence and Poverty: Challenge for the 1990s. Washington D.C.: Center for National Policy Press.

Styles, Melanie B., and Kristine V. Morrow
1992 Understanding How Youth and Elders Form Relationships: A Study of Four Linking Lifetimes Programs. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Wilson, William Julius
1987 The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A

SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Boston University

The Boston University mentoring program, in its third year of operation, matched 20 Boston University students with mentees from the Lewis Middle School during the 1990-91 academic year.

Boston University is a private university whose student body of 28,000 is predominantly white and middle-class; only 4.1 percent of its students are black. Boston University has had a long-standing relationship with the Lewis School through participation in the Boston Public Schools Collaborative, which was initiated by the university in 1975 to support school desegregation in Boston.

The Lewis Middle School is located in the Roxbury section of Boston and is a 20-minute cab or car ride or a 45-minute public transportation trip from Boston University. The vast majority of Lewis students are black, with only a few nonminority students. Most of the students are "disadvantaged."

Boston University's Collaborative office operates the mentoring program. Its staff consists of a professional staff director, who is budgeted 0.1 FTE (full-time equivalency) on the program; an administrative assistant, who works, as needed, on the director's various projects; a contact at Lewis, who is also one of the Lewis School's senior administrators; and two student coordinators, who receive work/study money for time spent on logistical work.

The staff director serves as the liaison to the contact at Lewis and provides advice and counseling to the student coordinators, but essentially lets the coordinators run the program. The administrative assistant serves as the first point of contact for the program. Since the program does not have a common meeting area, the administrative assistant often serves as the messenger from the mentors to the coordinators and the coordinators to the director. The student coordinators' responsibilities include all logistical work; program planning; and mentor supervision. They also served as mentors themselves.

The program elected to make only same-race matches. This decision meant that they recruited only black mentors, since the Lewis students were primarily black. Recruitment consisted of distributing flyers, participation in student activities fairs, word-of-mouth and presentations to black student organizations. Mentors who attended a series of pre-match meetings and interviews were accepted into the program.

Sixth- through eighth-graders were referred to the program by teachers at Lewis. Teachers were asked to submit the names of youth who were starting to miss school; had a recent decline in academic performance; had exhibited a recent preoccupation with sex; had emerging behavioral problems; or were frequently late for appointments. If a youth appeared on more than one list, the youth was considered at risk and a prime candidate for the program. The contact at the Lewis School had the responsibility for deciding which students were selected as mentees.

Mentor training consisted of a series of informal pre-match mentor meetings, during which the director and coordinators talked about mentoring. The mentees received a two-hour orientation from a student coordinator. The school contact usually conducts the orientation; this year, however, she was on leave during orientation. Training topics include the meaning of being responsible, being a mentee, and being in a relationship; appropriate behavior while on Boston University's campus; and the importance of showing up for program activities. The contact tells the mentees that the mentor will be similar to a pal or a big brother or big sister. Matching consisted primarily of self-selection and secondly a review of interest checklists.

Mentors were asked to commit to meeting with their mentee three hours a week for one academic year. Meetings were not required during school breaks or exams. Mentees made the same commitment--three hours per week for one academic year.

The program had several goals for participants. For the mentees, the program aimed to raise self-esteem, increase motivation for school, and show that there is something to strive for "out there." The director specifically excluded tutoring from the program. She felt that tutoring would not be effective until after a relationship developed, and believed academic improvement could be achieved indirectly through the mentoring relationship. For example, the director felt that increasing the mentees' self-esteem would motivate them to perform better in school. For the mentors, the program aimed to provide experience working with inner-city disadvantaged youth and increase their general level of responsibility.

The program consisted primarily of one-to-one activities. The program required mentors to contact their mentees on a weekly basis and plan an activity. Many mentors had difficulty contacting their mentees at home so they contacted them at the Lewis School. Generally, mentors met mentees at their school or home, but occasionally the mentees took public transportation to campus. Activities of mentoring pairs included shopping, eating, skating, attending movies and making trips to campus. There were several group activities, most notably three community service projects: a recycling drive, trash pick-up at a community agency and working for a day at a soup kitchen.

Connecticut College

The Connecticut College Tripartite Mentoring program, in its third year of operation, matched 22 Connecticut College students with fifth- through ninth-graders in the 1990-91 academic year. Most of the mentees live in the Winthrop housing project; the rest live in the surrounding community. Winthrop has 750 residents in 125 units. A majority of the residents are Hispanic and many of the families are headed by single mothers. The residents of Winthrop are considered at risk simply by virtue of where they live.

Connecticut College is a private college with 1,600 undergraduates located in New London, Connecticut. Only 125 students are from minority groups. New London has a population of approximately 30,000 residents, 20 percent of whom are from minority groups. Connecticut College students perform extensive community service work in the New London area.

The Office of Volunteer and Community Service (OVCS) operates the mentoring program. The program is also affiliated with Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Southeastern Connecticut and the participants are considered Big Brother/Big Sister matches. Its staff consists of a staff director, who spends 30 hours a week on the program; the OVCS director; a Big Brothers/Big Sisters case manager with 50 percent of her caseload consisting of the Tripartite matches; three student coordinators, who receive work/study money for logistical work; a faculty advisor; two school principals; and two guidance counselors.

The staff director is responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program. The OVCS director, who formerly ran the program, remains involved, but hired the staff director so she could devote more time to her other duties. One student coordinator works with the fifth- and sixth-grade mentees, one works with seventh- and eighth-grade mentees, and the other works with the mentors. The faculty advisor, who is also a chaplain, serves as liaison between the program and Connecticut College and provides counseling to the mentors. The Big Brothers/Big Sisters caseworker assists in screening participants, works with the school contacts and conducts weekly supervisory visits to the college. The two principals and two guidance counselors refer youth to the program and provide background information about the family and youth.

Classroom presentations, the yearly volunteer fair, minority student organizations and word-of-mouth were the primary means of mentor recruitment. The program emphasized minority recruitment, particularly of Hispanic students, but only four minority students were recruited.[1]

---

[1]Minority recruitment will always be difficult, since only 125 students are from minority groups.

Guidance counselors and principals referred the youth based on some combination of academic, behavior or family problems. Mentor screening consisted of an interview, a police check, completion of a standardized personality profile (16PF) and three references.[2] Youth completed applications and were interviewed by program staff.

Mentors participated in a one-day preprogram training session. Training included exercises on team-building and the role of a mentor, and discussion of inner-city issues, use of community resources and the importance of cultural sensitivity. In-program training consisted of three two-hour workshops coordinated by the Big Brothers/Big Sisters liaison. Youth training was primarily an orientation, held the night the mentees met their mentor. It consisted of program staff explaining the purpose of the program, informing the youth that tutoring was part of the program, and indicating that disruptive behavior would not be tolerated. Both mentors and mentees participated in Ropes Training, which is a team-building exercise. The OVCS director made the matches using the program staff's perceptions of introversion and extroversion. Limited use was made of the personality profile completed by the mentors. Where possible, program staff made matches of the same race and same gender.

Meetings were held on campus at regularly scheduled times. No meetings were held during school breaks or exams. OVCS staff, usually the student coordinators, picked up the mentees at Winthrop in an OVCS van and brought them to campus. Mentors committed to two hours of one-to-one time with their youth, two hours of participation in group activities and one hour for a mentor meeting per week.

Goals for the mentees included exposing them to college and life outside of Winthrop, providing a role model, social support and academic assistance. Mentor goals included developing a lifelong commitment to community service, defining a career path, developing parenting skills, developing a sense of self, and gaining an understanding of the life circumstances of at-risk children so that they can become advocates for social change.

The program was split into a fifth-/sixth-grade group and a seventh-/eighth-grade group. The fifth-/sixth-grade program split about evenly between group and one-to-one activities. Group activities consisted of discussions about family, friends, boyfriend/girlfriend relationships and self-esteem building exercises. The seventh-/eighth-grade program emphasized one-to-one interaction over group activities. Virtually all the interaction for both programs occurred on campus. The one exception was tutoring for the seventh- and eighth-graders, some of which took place at the middle school.

---

[2]These screening procedures are standard for a Big Brothers/Big Sisters program.

Georgetown University

The Georgetown University Young Scholars (GUYS) program matched 20 Georgetown students with seventh- through ninth-graders from the Sursum Corda housing project in the 1990-91 academic year. The Sursum Corda housing project, built in the late 1960s, houses 1,300 residents in 199 units. All the residents are black, with the exception of two units of Catholic nuns who have lived there since the project was built. About 85 percent of the residents are on welfare.

Georgetown is a private Catholic university located in Washington, D.C. The university is broadly diversified, with students from across the nation and the world. Approximately 8 percent of the students are black, with a total minority population (foreign students included) of 17 percent. There are approximately equal numbers of men and women. Georgetown has operated community service programs at Sursum Corda since it was built. In addition to GUYS, Georgetown currently runs a kindergarten through sixth-grade tutoring program and an adult literacy program at Sursum Corda.

The Volunteer and Public Service Center operates the GUYS program. The staff for GUYS consists of a professional staff director, who spends roughly two days a week on the program; a psychologist, who is contracted for 100 hours for the academic year; a contact at the housing project, who works 20 hours a week for 25 weeks a year for all three community service programs; two student coordinators who receive work/study money for time spent on logistical work; and two additional unpaid student coordinators.

The staff director runs the program and provides extensive direction to the rest of the program staff. The psychologist participates in the training sessions, conducts personal development sessions during the program, attends some of the mentor meetings, and is available for mentors on an individual basis to discuss their match. The contact at Sursum Corda refers youth to the program, serves as the voice for GUYS at the housing project and helps gather the mentees for the weekly meetings. The work/study student coordinators perform both logistical work (e.g., driving the van to transport youth to the weekly meetings) and program planning. The non-work/study coordinators spend more time on programmatic than logistical work.

GUYS recruited only black mentors, though a non-black mentor was one of the founders of the program. Recruitment consisted of distributing flyers, participation in student activities fairs, word-of-mouth and presentations to black student organizations (e.g., Georgetown NAACP and the black student association).

The housing project contact referred the mentees. She referred youth who were doing well at school but were starting to hang out with "bad kids." Both mentors and mentees completed applications and were interviewed by program staff.

Mentors participated in a preprogram overnight training session. Training consisted of role-playing, "what-if" situations, program planning, and a discussion of the appropriate means of dealing with suspected abuse cases. The mentees did not receive any preprogram training. In addition to matching participants by race and gender, program staff looked at their personalities in trying to judge which pairs would fit best together.

GUYS program activities took place on campus every Saturday afternoon during the academic year from 2:00 to 4:30. There were no meetings during school breaks or exams. Mentors committed themselves to attending the weekly meetings and calling their mentees once a week. There were mentor meetings every other Monday, but attendance was not mandatory. The mentees committed themselves to attending from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. every Saturday. The extra 90 minutes required of the mentees each week were spent organizing them at the housing project and transporting them to campus in a van belonging to the Volunteer and Public Service Center.

GUYS had several goals for mentees: foremost among these were showing them that there was life beyond Sursum Corda and raising their self-esteem as African Americans. The program was particularly interested in repudiating negative African-American stereotypes; increasing the mentees' knowledge of African-American history and culture; and improving their academic, writing and public speaking skills. The primary goal for the mentors was to give them a quality learning opportunity in working with disadvantaged inner-city black youth. Another explicit goal was to improve the quality of service that Georgetown provides to Sursum Corda.

GUYS was a hybrid of group and one-to-one activities. Every Saturday had a theme. The first hour consisted of a film or a presentation centered around that theme, with groups of one or two pairs discussing the theme in the second hour. During the third hour, the mentees would talk to the group or write about the theme. Several times a semester, there were unstructured, one-to-one days. These Saturdays typically consisted of hanging out on campus, attending a campus activity (e.g., Spring Fest), or playing sports.

GUYS emphasized academic skills-building rather than tutoring. The program director wanted to improve academic skills by disguising learning in the program. For example, he planned to improve mentees' writing skills by having them work on a newsletter for the housing project and to enhance their public speaking skills by having them speak to the group about the weekly theme.

Michigan State University

The Spartan Buddies mentoring program at Michigan State University had two components: group mentoring at five community agencies and cascade mentoring at four elementary or middle schools. In the group mentoring program, Spartan Buddies worked at community-based, after-school drop-in centers. In many cases, the Spartan Buddies acted as aides to center staff. The cascade model required a team of two Spartan Buddies to mentor either four middle school or eight elementary school students.

Michigan State University is a large public university located in East Lansing, Michigan. Michigan State University is one of the largest universities in the country, with 31,400 students. About 17 percent of the students are from minority groups; 6 percent are black. Approximately the same number of men and women are enrolled.

Michigan State's Service Learning Center operates the Spartan Buddies program. The Service Learning Center offers volunteer opportunities across the entire community service spectrum. The director of the Service Learning Center provides general oversight, but Spartan Buddies is just one of many programs she oversees, so the time she spends on the program is limited.

The staff of Spartan Buddies consists of two graduate students with student coordinators at each of the community centers. One graduate student works 20 hours a week on recruitment, training and placement of mentors. The second graduate student works with the schools on the cascade program and assists the first graduate student, as needed, in her duties. Both graduate student positions are paid.

There is one student coordinator at each of the agencies that have Spartan Buddies. The coordinators serve as the liaison between Michigan State University and the agencies, and report problems to the staff at the Service Learning Center. The student coordinators do not receive work/study money.

Mentor recruitment consisted of advertising in the school newspaper, class presentations, passing out flyers, and word-of-mouth. Minority students and males were targeted when the initial group of recruits was composed primarily of white women.

There was no youth recruitment at the drop-in centers, since they were free to come and go as they pleased. For the cascade program, teachers recommended youth who were on the verge of getting into trouble or were potential dropouts.

The mentor screening process consisted of completing an application, attending an orientation session and being interviewed by one of the graduate student coordinators. Almost all the applicants (99%) were accepted for the program. Mentors made a three- to four-hour weekly commitment for two terms. (Michigan State University is on the quarter system.) There was no preprogram mentor training. In-service training consisted

of two one-hour sessions each term. Topics ranged from working with at-risk youth to developing a relationship. There was no mentee training.

There was no formal one-to-one matching in either the group or the cascade mentoring programs. Program staff felt that an affinity would evolve naturally between youth and mentors who interact for other reasons (e.g., tutoring) and they would eventually develop a relationship. The only criterion was to have one man and one woman on the two-person Spartan Buddies teams in the cascade program.

Mentors were assigned to agencies based on a combination of their preferences and the compatibility of their schedule with the available time slots at the programs. At times, transportation was a problem. Some mentors had to spend more than 30 minutes taking public transportation to their site. Program staff eliminated cost as a transportation issue by providing bus tokens, but time was still a major consideration.

Improving study skills was an important goal for the mentees at all the schools and community-based agencies. Other goals included building mentees' self-confidence, teaching them how to use leisure and recreation time positively, and helping them learn more about themselves. In addition, the middle school cascade program had as a goal the teaching of mentoring skills so that the mentees could themselves mentor elementary school students.

The Spartan Buddy program is group-focused and specific activities varied by site. At the schools, tutoring and help with homework were the main areas of focus. At the community centers, activities ranged from help with homework to participating in recreational activities. To a large extent, the activities on any single day were a function of which youth showed up and what they wanted to do.

Porterville Community College

The Porterville Community College mentoring program (Success Unlimited) matched 13 ninth-grade Hispanic girls from Porterville High School with 11 Porterville Community College students. Program staff selected Porterville High School because the staff director and Porterville Community College had a good relationship with the high school.

Porterville is a rural, agricultural community of approximately 20,000 residents located in the central valley of California. The community has a large population of Hispanic migrant workers. The college draws virtually all of its students, many of whom are part-time students, from the local community. Many of the community college students qualify for Extended Opportunity Program Services (EOPS), a state-funded program for economically disadvantaged students. The mentoring program is the first formal link between Porterville High School and Porterville Community College, but the informal links were strong because the director and many of the mentors attended Porterville High School.

The EOPS office operates the mentoring program. Staffing consists of a professional staff director, who spends roughly eight hours a week on the mentoring program; an EOPS counselor; two paid student coordinators; and a counselor at Porterville High School.

The staff director is extensively involved in running the program. Her responsibilities include reviewing the mentors' weekly contact logs; meeting with the mentors individually once a month; and planning and facilitating weekly mentor training and monthly parent workshops. The EOPS counselor oversees the program in the director's absence; serves as the liaison with Porterville High School, students and trainers; helps recruit and screen mentors; and schedules the meetings between mentors and mentees. Both student assistants spend about 10 hours a week on the program. One assistant performs mostly clerical tasks, while the other assists with the liaison responsibilities and planning the weekly mentor and monthly parent meetings.

The program recruited women between the ages of 18 and 30 who were good students and academically motivated. Some recruitment was done by promoting the program through the faculty, but most of the recruiting was a personal effort on the part of the program director. The director targeted 18 college students, who were sent letters asking them to apply for the program; 14 responded and 11 were accepted. Most mentors were low-income Hispanic women.

Junior high school counselors, teachers and administrators identified 75 girls in Spring 1990 as candidates for the program. School staff identified girls who were quiet or shy; lacked confidence; couldn't find their niche; and were on the borderline of failure once they reached high school. The identified youth were sent information regarding the program, and 13 were eventually matched.

Mentors committed themselves to meeting with their mentee twice a week for a total of two hours; one hour a week of mentor training; a monthly meeting with the program director; a monthly workshop also attended by the mentees and parents; and completing weekly logs. Mentors received a $75-a-month stipend to offset transportation costs. Two mentors participated as part of an internship and received course credit. Youth committed to the twice-weekly sessions with their mentor and the monthly workshops with their parents and mentors.

There was no pre-match training for either the mentors or the mentees, just brief orientations. There was, however, extensive in-program training. For mentors, training consisted of learning techniques to improve the mentees' self-esteem, developing effective communication skills, identifying stress and developing effective study skills. For mentees, training was done through monthly two-hour workshops. Topics included dating and pregnancy, AIDS, decision-making, study skills, test-taking and the importance of education.

The program aimed to ensure a good match between the skills of the mentors and the needs of the mentees. For example, a mentor enrolled in remedial math was not matched with a mentee in need of help in algebra. The program director's personal knowledge of the mentors was a key part of the matching process. The goal for the mentees was to successfully make the transition to high school. Each match had short-term, primarily weekly goals that were discussed during individual monthly meetings between the mentors and the program director. There were no identifiable goals for the mentors.

All program activities, with the exception of the monthly parent, mentee and mentor meeting, were one-to-one and took place at Porterville High School. All mentors were required to have a car, so transportation problems were effectively eliminated. One of the two weekly meetings took place during class time; the other took place after school or at lunch. The mentors were required to follow a regular meeting schedule and to sign in when they arrived at Porterville High School. The program was structured in its scheduling but not in its content. Activities included tutoring as needed (a specific number of hours was not required); socializing over lunch with other pairs; and allowing the girls to discuss the problems they were experiencing.

West Virginia Wesleyan College

The West Virginia Wesleyan program matched eight Wesleyan students with fourth- and (mostly) fifth-graders from the French Creek Elementary School in the 1990-91 academic year. French Creek is located about 10 miles from campus. Program staff selected French Creek because the poorest families in the county live in its school district and its children are described as "epitomizing" rural poverty. Over 75 percent of the children receive free or reduced-price lunches, and West Virginia Wesleyan has run various community service programs at French Creek since 1986.

Wesleyan is a private Methodist university located in Buchannon, West Virginia. Buchannon is located in rural Upshur county, which has 23,000 residents--almost all of whom are white, and most of whom can be considered members of the working class. Wesleyan is a regional college, with 30 percent of its students from West Virginia and the rest from the Middle Atlantic and New England states. The majority of students receive degrees in business or education. Only 5 percent of the students are minorities.

The Office of Volunteer Programs coordinates the mentoring program. The only staff member is the director, who spends two days a week on the program. The director handles all program logistics; there are no student coordinators or volunteers. A support person is available to take messages when the director is not available. The director has contact with the principal and some of the teachers at French Creek, but the interaction is minimal.

The director attempted to recruit a racially diverse group of mentors but did not emphasize the effort, given that there were few minority students at the college and the mentees were not from minority groups. A more sustained effort was made to recruit males for same-gender matches. Recruitment consisted of personal recruiting efforts by the director and the posting of flyers around campus. The director was familiar with many students and recruited the ones she thought would be most suitable for the program. Recruitment began the previous spring, with five mentors selected at that time.

The teachers at French Creek referred the youth to the program. All the referred youth were in some way academically at risk. One teacher referred youth with a low self-concept; another teacher referred youth who were experiencing first-time academic problems, while another referred youth who were at risk of academic problems but had not yet experienced difficulties.

Mentors received 20 hours of training on understanding Appalachian values, child development, learning methods and identifying child abuse. The mentors toured a juvenile correction facility to reinforce their mission of keeping mentees out of such a facility. The mentees received only an orientation. Matching was a combination of a review of applications in search of mentors and mentees with similar interests, self-selection and random assignment. All matches were same-race. Five matches were cross-gender, with a female mentor and a male mentee.

All mentors had "learning contracts" that clearly stipulated the level of their commitment. A learning contract is an agreement between a student and a professor, analogous to independent study or field work, that stipulates the requirements the student must fulfill to receive three credits. All learning contracts required three hours a week of contact with the mentee, a one-hour weekly seminar with required readings and periodic meetings with a professor. All learning contracts required a paper on the theme of the contract, which ranged from adolescent development to a comparative analysis of Appalachian culture.

The learning contracts listed goals for the matches. The primary goal for the mentees was improvement in academic performance and behavior. The most frequently mentioned goals were improvements in test scores, greater participation in classroom discussions and improved reading ability. The goal for the mentors was to fulfill the requirements of their learning contracts. Ideally, the mentor would complete the program with a better understanding of the subject area of the learning contract.

Meetings were all one-to-one and primarily occurred at French Creek. Program staff encouraged, but did not require, the mentors to visit the mentees at their homes. The typical match met for three hours a week, with one hour spent with the mentee in class, one hour at lunch or recess and one hour after school. There were four group activities, consisting of one trip each to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Charleston, West Virginia, a pumpkin-carving and a movie day on campus.

Xavier University

The Xavier University mentoring program, in its third year of operation, matched 24 sixth- through eighth-graders from the Daneel School with college students in the 1990-91 academic year. The Daneel School is located within walking distance of campus. Program staff and teachers characterize Daneel students as poor, black, inner-city youth. The community is considered poor in resources for youth (e.g., no movie theaters or recreation programs).

Xavier is an historically black, private, Catholic university located in New Orleans, Louisiana. There are 2,200 undergraduates, about 90 percent of whom are black. Approximately 65 percent of the students are from Louisiana, and 95 percent receive financial aid. Xavier University has run community service programs at Daneel for at least eight years. There are currently five different mentoring programs at Daneel, though this program is the only one that targets older students.

The Student Services Office operates the mentoring program. Staff consists of a professional staff director, who coordinates 15 programs and spends 10 hours a week on the CPIL mentoring program; a senior student coordinator, paid through a grant, who works 20 hours a week; one junior student coordinator; and several work/study students who work, as needed, on the projects run through Student Services.

The staff director provides oversight, but the program is essentially run by the senior student coordinator. The senior coordinator serves as the liaison with the teachers, participates in the mentor selection process, informally supervises the mentors and handles most of the logistics. Her position is funded through a grant that is normally awarded to a graduate student. The second coordinator position was created to relieve some of the burden on the senior coordinator.

Mentor recruitment consisted of participation in a volunteer fair, presentations and word-of-mouth. Attendance at an orientation session and an interview with the staff director and/or senior student coordinator were the main components of the mentor screening process. The staff director reviewed each mentor's academic record and current class schedule to verify that mentors had time for the program and were in good academic standing. She also examined their counseling records to see whether there was something in their background that should disqualify them.

The program had an open admissions policy for mentees. The school sent home letters to parents of all the children in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades telling them about the program and asking that they allow their child to participate. They asked the parents to complete a brief application form that, in addition to demographic information, requested information about the child's interests. At the conclusion of the application and screening process, 24 mentees and 19 mentors were accepted into the program.

Mentor training consisted of two pre-match sessions. Staff and former mentors discussed roles and expectations for a mentor, explicitly differentiating them from those of a parent or teacher. In addition, they discussed working with parents, goal-setting, maintaining confidentiality, and getting the relationship off to a good start. Youth training had two parts. The staff director went to Daneel and introduced all the mentoring programs Xavier was running at the school. The senior student coordinator followed this with two 90-minute training sessions. The latter sessions consisted of a discussion of what the mentees could expect from the mentors and what the program expected of the mentees.

Most of the matching was done by comparing personality types, using information collected as part of the application process. A few matches were made by self-selection. All matches were same-race and same-gender.

The goals for the mentees were to expose them to college, provide them with recreational opportunities not available in the community, and assist them academically. For the mentors, the program is designed to help them understand the needs of the community and to make them feel they are part of it.

The program consisted of informal one-to-one sessions, structured group sessions, and once-a-month outreach days. One-to-one sessions were scheduled to occur twice a month for two to four hours. A telephone call could substitute for one of the meetings. The one-to-one meetings could occur at any time, including before or after the group sessions. Some mentors met their mentees at Daneel, but most meetings took place on campus. The one-to-one sessions focused on relationship-building and tutoring.

The group sessions were held on campus every other Saturday. Activities were designed to help mentees develop better communication skills, increase self-esteem, handle peer pressure, address health and sexual issues, and make responsible decisions. Once a month, after the conclusion of the regular group meeting, mentors and mentees participated in the Xavier University community outreach day. On outreach days, the community was invited to campus to use the campus facilities. Mentors and mentees tended to use the recreational facilities on outreach days.

APPENDIX B

METHODS

The evaluation of the CPIL project was designed to address a core set of issues specific to institutionally created mentoring relationships between college students and at-risk youth, and to contribute to the slowly building body of research in the field of adult/youth relationships. The research was also designed to assist both current and future CPIL programs with program development and self-evaluation.

P/PV conducted four separate but closely interrelated studies: 1) an implementation study to address issues of school/university linkages, program structure, training, supervision and support services; 2) a relationship formation study designed to shed light on the relationships that develop between college students and at-risk youth; 3) an outcomes study that investigates the benefits to both parties in the mentoring pairs; and 4) a survey of college students that explores the level of their interest and motivation in mentoring at-risk youth. The first three of these studies are fully described in this appendix; data from the survey of college students provide extensive information on their views of and participation in community service and mentoring. Space does not permit discussion of the results in this report. P/PV is preparing a separate paper presenting these findings.[1]

Campus Compact's primary reasons for participating in the research were to enable its staff to assist future CPIL projects in program development and evaluation efforts, and to provide useful information for ongoing monitoring of and technical assistance to participating sites. To this end, CPIL staff worked closely with P/PV throughout the research effort. Specifically, CPIL staff were actively involved in site selection, provision of background information on the individual sites, coordination of site visits, and data collection for the college student survey and implementation studies.

SITE SELECTION

Twelve sites received program development grants from CPIL during the 1990-91 academic year and were eligible to participate in the research. The study design called for selecting as wide a variety of programs as possible, given the limited number of sites. Selection criteria included developing a mixture of programs by their number of years in

---

[1]The survey of college students sought to establish, first, their level of interest in participating in community service, their prior community service experience, and their reasons for involvement or noninvolvement. Second, it specifically examined college students' interest in mentoring 11- to 15-year-old at-risk youth, their perceptions of mentoring, and factors that might motivate them to become mentors.

Data were collected early in the Fall 1990 semester at Georgetown University, Porterville Community College and West Virginia Wesleyan College. The survey was self-administered in groups of classes that roughly mirrored the overall demographic composition of each school. Overall, 817 students completed the questionnaire.

operation (first or subsequent year); type (public or private) and size of institution; region of the country; and fidelity to the CPIL guidelines.

Of the 12 CPIL sites, five were in their second or third year of operation and seven were in their first year.[2] From the 12, seven--Boston University, Connecticut College, Georgetown University, Michigan State University, Porterville Community College, West Virginia Wesleyan College and Xavier University--were selected to participate in the research.[3] Table B.1 shows the seven sites and the studies in which they participated.

Although Michigan State University was selected for the research study, it was not included in the analysis reported here. After visiting Michigan State, P/PV staff determined that the program model differed from other programs in critical ways, primarily in the absence of one-to-one pairs of mentors and youth, and thus could not be included in the analysis.[4]

IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

CPIL sites vary along a number of dimensions, including staffing patterns, target populations, mentor training, match supervision and mentor/youth activities. The implementation study examined the variations in design, implementation and overall effectiveness,

---

[2]The programs in their second or third year were: Boston University, Connecticut College, Metropolitan (Minnesota) State College, Michigan State University and Xavier (Louisiana) University. The programs in their first year were: Georgetown University, Porterville (California) Community College, Stanford University, University of California-Santa Cruz, University of the Pacific, University of Puget Sound and West Virginia Wesleyan College.

[3]See Appendix A for a description of the programs.

[4]Michigan State University operated a group mentoring program and a cascade mentoring program. The group mentoring program involved after-school drop-in programs at five community centers. The college students were assigned to a community center and usually went there at the same time each week. Activities at the community center included everything from tutoring to participating in recreational activities.

In the cascade program, a team of two mentors worked with either four middle school or eight elementary school youth. Academic skills-building and tutoring were the primary focus of the cascade programs. The cascade program for middle schools had the additional goal of teaching the students to be mentors so that they in turn could mentor elementary school youth.

At the time of the initial site visit, Michigan State University staff were planning to initiate a program at one community center in which one-to-one matching would occur. When sufficient funding for implementation of the program was not identified, the program was dropped.

See Appendix A for a more detailed description of the Michigan State University program.

Table B.1

CPIL PROGRAMS BY PARTICIPATION
IN RESEARCH STUDIES

	STUDY				
Site	Implementation	Relationship Formation	Mentee Outcomes	Mentor Outcomes	Survey of College Students
Boston University	X	X	X	X	
Connecticut College	X	X	X	X	
Georgetown University	X			X	X
Michigan State University	X	X		X	
Porterville Community College	X			X	X
West Virginia Wesleyan College	X			X	X
Xavier University	X	X	X	X	

with a particular focus on program practices and components that support mentoring. The questions addressed include:

- What organizational and administrative practices and procedures support mentoring? How much structuring of the nature and frequency of the interactions is required? To what extent must the progress of the relationship be monitored? What components are necessary to create and sustain satisfied matches?

- Beyond one-to-one contact between youth and college students, what programmatic components (tutoring, group activities, mentor support groups, etc.) significantly influence the effectiveness of CPIL programs? How can colleges and universities interact effectively with schools and other target agencies?

Field work for the implementation study was conducted during the 1990-91 academic year. Staff from P/PV and CPIL visited each site twice to interview college and university personnel who initiated and support the programs; interview program staff at the universities and target agency; observe program activities; and review program records.

Each site was visited early in the academic year to collect data on recruitment and screening, orientation and training, staffing patterns, matching practices and initial program activities. In general, interviews were conducted with college/university deans, program directors, student coordinators and other program staff, and with staff at the target agency, including school principals, teachers and counselors. As much as possible, staff timed visits so that they were able to observe some program activity--orientation, training, a group activity, a mentor support meeting, and/or tutoring.

The second visit, near the conclusion of the academic year, focused on supervision procedures, in-service training, the extent to which initial matches had been sustained over the year, plans for closing out matches, and perceptions (of both staff and mentors) of how successfully programs had been implemented and the problems they had encountered. During this second visit, research staff reviewed program records (to the extent they were available) that provided data on attendance, frequency of meetings and supervisory activity.

Data collected through these site visits were summarized in uniform structured reports that provide a complete picture and assessment of each individual program. These site visit reports were then analyzed to determine program practices and components that contribute to the successful implementation of college student mentoring programs.

RELATIONSHIP FORMATION STUDY

While the implementation study can shed light on the program practices that help sustain matches over the course of the program, it does not help us understand the content of these matches. The relationship formation study was designed to determine what occurs

in mentoring relationships under the program structures and circumstances found in the CPIL sites.

As noted in Table B.1, four of the seven CPIL sites were selected to participate in the relationship formation study. Established programs were selected to avoid confounding any program start-up effects with relationship formation. As discussed earlier, however, the lack of one-to-one matches in the Michigan State University program resulted in their exclusion from the research. Thus, relationships in the remaining three selected sites--Boston University, Connecticut College and Xavier University--were examined.

Study Design

This research builds on an earlier study of relationship formation between elder mentors and at-risk youth (Styles and Morrow, 1992). However, the unique features of the CPIL initiative result in a study that focuses on the age, developmental level and lifestyle of the college student mentors; on the middle school youth's response; and on the various program practices and their effects on relationship development. Specifically, the following research questions are addressed:

- What is the essential nature of the relationships between college student mentors and middle school youth? Do they resemble peer relationships in their particular configuration of give and take? Or, given the programs' requirements for tutoring, are they more like teacher/student interactions?

- What roles do college student mentors commonly assume and play with youth? Which of these roles are the most and least effective?

- Are there particular advantages or liabilities associated with the age proximity of the partners and with the relative youth or maturity of the mentors themselves?

- Are there particular advantages or drawbacks associated with the fact that the mentors are enrolled as college students? How do youth, and the developing relationships, respond to the frequent and lengthy breaks characteristic of an academic calendar? Do the resources provided by a college campus enhance the relationships?

- How effective are the various program practices in facilitating relationships? Are some practices more conducive to one-to-one relationship development? Do any program practices impede relationship formation or detract from relationship quality?

The answers that emerge from the analysis provide a comprehensive portrait or typology of common relationships that develop; a set of criteria and interactive practices that

distinguish constructive from problematic relationships; and a set of best practices for mentors and programs operating under CPIL or similar campus-based initiatives.

Interviewing and Sample Selection

Data were collected through semistructured interviews conducted separately with youth and mentors. The interviews explored in detail the nature of the interactions between mentor and youth. Although the research design called for both partners in the matches to be interviewed twice, several factors precluded collection of complete data. At Xavier University, a teachers strike at the target school delayed identification of youth and subsequently matching. At the time of the first site visit in mid-November, many matches had not yet met and the remainder had met only once. Thus, only one round of interviews was conducted--late in the spring semester (April)--with youth and mentors in the Xavier University program.

Two rounds of interviews were conducted at both Boston University and Connecticut College, one during the fall semester a few weeks following initial matching, and another late in the spring semester near the end of the program. In several cases, however, researchers were unable to reinterview both members of a match. The 139 interviews conducted represent a total of 55 matches across the three programs: 14 matches at Boston University, 22 matches at Connecticut College and 19 matches at Xavier University.[5]

Due to the labor-intensive nature of the analysis, 29 of the 55 matches were randomly selected for full review. The sample was developed by stratifying all matches by three frequency-of-meeting categories and selecting a representative group from within each stratum.

Data from both interviews and surveys (collected as part of the outcomes study) were used to develop the frequency-of-meeting categories. Information obtained from mentors was compared with youth's reports; and, particularly when interviews were missing, follow-up survey data were used to determine how frequently each match met over the year. Three distinct patterns emerged, resulting in three strata: 1) mentors and youth who met regularly and individually at least once every two weeks, designated as frequent meeters; 2) matches in which meeting occurred sporadically, but at least once each month (and for whom no more than five weeks had passed since their last meeting), designated as periodic meeters; and 3) matches that had never met consistently or had no contact for at least six weeks, designated as rare meeters.

---

[5]Of these 55 matches, two were discarded because they were introduced by the program much later as replacements for matches that had dissolved, and four were discarded due to extensive missing data on both interviews and survey questionnaires. Thus, the final sample available for analysis consisted of 49 matches.

Matches were stratified by frequency of meeting for two reasons. Since participation in the program was voluntary for both youth and mentors, the frequency of one-to-one meetings provides a good initial indication of how well mentors attracted youth and constructed relationships that were sufficiently meaningful to keep both partners involved. Also, preliminary analysis of the interviews suggested that frequency of meeting was likely to correlate with such variables as the youth's perception of the mentor as an advocate or source of support.

Of the 49 analyzable matches, 17 (35%) met frequently, 11 (22%) met regularly and 21 (43%) met rarely. Overall, 61 percent of the matches were female. Approximately 60 percent of the matches were selected for analysis: 10 frequent meeters (seven female, three male), seven regular meeters (four female, three male) and 12 rare meeters (six female, six male). Of these 29 matches, eight were from Boston University, 13 were from Connecticut College and eight were from Xavier University. In all cases, both members of the match were interviewed at least once. In 12 cases, both parties were interviewed twice; in seven matches, one partner was interviewed twice and one was interviewed once; in the remaining 10 matches, both mentor and youth were interviewed only once.

Analysis

Analysis of the interview data was an iterative process that proceeded in three phases. The first phase was inductive, designed so that the data could suggest important themes, categories and patterns for further analysis, thereby avoiding the imposition of a set of predetermined categories onto the relationships. Researchers reviewed each interview to identify for further analysis categories of relationship content that appeared to play a critical role in relationship development; clear patterns in the frequency of meeting; and common patterns in partners' interactions. Specifically, three general types or categories of variables emerged. First, behavioral variables included descriptions of what the pairs did when they met. The second category, affective or attitudinal variables, included indications of how each member of the pair felt about the other and about the relationship. Finally, interactional variables depicted patterns of interactions between the pair members including decision-making processes and the distribution of power. An overriding critical factor that this initial overview identified was youth satisfaction. While relationships that met frequently demonstrated a range of types of interaction, they almost all appeared to have some measure of youth's reported satisfaction in common.

Upon completing the initial readings, 12 matches were randomly selected for more rigorous analysis. The goal of this phase was to develop a typology of relationships. Youth were a particular focus of this phase, since the overview had suggested that youth satisfaction was a critical element in whether a particular match was successful.

The first part of this phase involved identifying, from the broader set of interactional, attitudinal and behavioral variables, a smaller set of recurring, critical variables. The

second part entailed checking for interactions among this smaller set of variables. In these 12 matches, the primary predictor of whether a pair would meet and be more successful was youth satisfaction.

In the third phase, the relationships typology was applied to the full set of 29 matches. Matches were grouped by frequency of meeting, controlling for external factors, such as a mentee's moving away and changes in the mentor's student or employment status. By isolating matches whose frequency of meeting was determined by the participants' choice, the hypothesis that satisfied youth are more likely to meet their mentors and remain in relationships than dissatisfied youth could be tested.

The final measure of youth's satisfaction with the relationship was based on five indicators:

1. The youth's degree of liking for the mentor;
2. The youth's degree of liking for the relationship;
3. The value the youth places on the relationship (if satisfied) derived from:
   a. whether the youth wished the relationship to continue;
   b. whether the youth would feel a sense of loss if the relationship were to end; and
   c. whether the youth feels the mentor played a role of significance in his/her life.

Youth were considered satisfied if responses in at least four of these five criteria were positive; if only the first two criteria drew positive responses, youth were considered partly satisfied.

While youth's satisfaction was an important determinant of whether a given match was successful or unsuccessful, frequency of meeting was also taken into account in the final classification of the 29 matches into successful, conditionally successful and unsuccessful categories for the final analysis.[6]

OUTCOMES STUDY

CPIL expects both the at-risk youth who participate in the program and their college student mentors to benefit from the experience. Program directors expected that the experience of having a mentor would increase the youth's self-esteem; increase their exposure to cultural, social and recreational opportunities; improve their academic performance; and temper their antisocial behavior. For the college students, program staff also had a broad range of goals--primarily that they develop leadership skills, serve the

[6]Both satisfaction and frequency of meeting are important to consider in determining the success of a match, since in some cases, external factors (such as moving out of the school district) affected the longevity of a match.

community, improve their personal skills and learn that they can make a difference in the world.

Design Strategy

An experimental or quasi-experimental research design was rejected in favor of an outcomes study for two reasons. First, an experimental or quasi-experimental design is most appropriate when a program has a firm model that has been in place for at least several years. Second, the size of the CPIL programs (eight to 24 matches) would make an experimental or quasi-experimental design expensive and difficult to implement.

Thus, since most CPIL programs were small and in only their first or third year of operation, an outcomes study was the more appropriate choice. The outcomes study represents a low-cost means of developing an estimate of the potential effects of the program on the participants; an opportunity to get a thorough description of program participants; and a means of obtaining participant reaction to the program.

The original research design called for inclusion of all participants in the four programs that had been in operation for more than a year. Newer programs were excluded to avoid confounding start-up effects with the outcomes. Michigan State University was one of the "old" sites, leaving three sites (Boston University, Connecticut College and Xavier University) as the basis of the outcomes study.

At the time data were collected for the outcomes study, data were also being collected from mentors as part of the survey of college students at Georgetown University, Porterville Community College and West Virginia Wesleyan College. Since program directors had to convene a mentor meeting to administer the questionnaire anyway, the outcomes questions were added to the survey. In this way, the sample size, which was quite small initially, was increased with minimal effort or cost.[7] The mentor outcomes study therefore includes data from all sites except Michigan State University.

Data Collection Strategy

Data were collected through the administration of baseline and follow-up questionnaires to youth and mentors. The baseline questionnaires collected background and demographic information, as well as measures of attitudes, perceptions and behavior. These baseline data provide descriptive information on both the youth and the college students participating in the programs.

Since the students were required to commit to the program for an academic year, the follow-up questionnaires were administered late in the spring semester near the conclu-

[7]The concern that start-up effects would muddle the outcomes analysis proved unfounded. There were no differences in outcomes for the new sites relative to the old sites.

sion of their participation. Items used to measure attitudes, perceptions and behavior at baseline were repeated so that changes could be detected. In addition, these instruments collected information on activities the pairs participated in over the year, and on both mentors' and mentees' perceptions of the program.

By design, many participants at Boston University, Connecticut College and Xavier University participated in both the relationship formation study and the outcomes study. To the extent possible, the participants' responses in the two studies were linked, providing a deeper picture of the individual matches.

Because many of the outcomes of interest involved attitudes and perceptions, self-reported data provided the most reliable source of information for the outcomes study. For school-related performance, such as attendance and grades, teacher assessments and/or school records data would have provided supporting evidence for the self-reports. Due to the small sample size and to limited resources, however, these data sources were not pursued.

Instrument Development

In developing the instruments, there was particular concern about their appropriateness for mentees--a group of disadvantaged 10- to 15-year-olds with a wide range of reading abilities, many of whom may have been completing a survey for the first time. There was little similar concern regarding the mentors, since they periodically complete all types of surveys as college students.

For the mentees, the questions on behavior and demographics were straightforward, had high face validity and, a priori, generated little worry that the mentees would have difficulty understanding them. The attitudinal questions, on the other hand, generated considerable concern about mentees' ability to provide valid and reliable data. The attitudinal questions included self-concept scales (global self-worth, social acceptance and scholastic competence) from Harter's (1985) self-perception profile for children; the abbreviated seventh- through 12th-grade locus of control scale (Nowicki and Strickland, 1973); and 12 social support questions developed by P/PV with assistance from Benjamin Gottlieb. Figure B.1 presents examples of the behavioral and attitudinal questions.

Several precautions were taken to ensure that these questions generated high-quality data, including using questions that had been tested on a similar age group, pretesting the instrument, controlling the testing environment and preparing a Spanish version of the questionnaire.

A major concern was using questions that were age-appropriate for the mentee sample. The sample consisted of fifth- through ninth-graders, evenly divided between the fifth and sixth grades and the seventh through ninth grades. The self-concept questions had been tested on third- through sixth-graders, but Harter (1985) indicates that they are also

Figure B.1

EXAMPLES OF MENTEE SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIORS, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, AND SOCIAL SUPPORT QUESTIONS

SELF-CONCEPT

On the next few pages we have some sentences that talk about different kinds of kids. We are interested in what kind of kid you are. Remember, this is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. And, since kids are very different from one another, each of you will be putting down a different answer.

First let me explain how these questions work. Look at the question marked EXAMPLE. This question talks about two kinds of kids, and we want to know which kids you are most like. Each of these questions has two parts: Part (A) and Part (B).

> Part (A): First, I want you to decide if you are more like the kids on the left side--those who would rather play outdoors, or if you are more like the kids on the right side--those who would rather watch T.V. Check the box next to the kids you are most like.
>
> Part (B): Now that you have decided which kind of kids you are like, I want you to decide if it is just sort of true for you or if it is really true for you. Circle the one that fits you best.

EXAMPLE:

(A)	☐	Some kids would rather play outdoors in their free time.	BUT	☐	Other kids would rather watch T.V.
(B)	1)	This is really true for me.		1)	This is really true for me.
	2)	This is sort of true for me.		2)	This is sort of true for me.

	☐	Some kids feel that they are very good at their schoolwork.	BUT	☐	Other kids worry about whether they can do the schoolwork assigned to them.
	1)	This is really true for me.		1)	This is really true for me.
	2)	This is sort of true for me.		2)	This is sort of true for me.

Figure B.1 (Continued)

EXAMPLES OF MENTEE SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIORS, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, AND SOCIAL SUPPORT QUESTIONS

LOCUS OF CONTROL

Next we would like to ask you some questions about your feelings and your beliefs. For each question circle yes or no, whichever best describes how you feel.

a.	Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them?	1) yes	0) no
b.	Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault?	1) yes	0) no

ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIORS

Since school started in September how many times have you done each of the following things? For each activity, if you have not done it during the school year, circle 0; if you have done it once or twice, circle 1; if you have done it three to five times, circle 2; if you have done it six or more times, circle 3.

		Never	Once or Twice	Three to Five	Six or More
a.	Skip a class	0	1	2	3
b.	Purposely damage or destroy property that did not belong to you	0	1	2	3

Figure B.1 (Continued)

EXAMPLES OF MENTEE SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIORS, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, AND SOCIAL SUPPORT QUESTIONS

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT

Below we have listed several activities, some of which you may never have done before and others which you may have done many times. For each activity, if you have never done it before, circle 0; if you've done an activity once or twice, circle 1; if you have done it three to five times, circle 2; if you have done it six or more times, circle 3.

		Never	Once or Twice	Three to Five	Six or More
a.	Visited a college campus	0	1	2	3
b.	Visited a museum	0	1	2	3

SOCIAL SUPPORT

Can you think of any adults who are especially important to you?

1) yes 0) no

If yes: Who are they, and are they a relative, friend, teacher or something else?

First name or initial	Relationship (for example: relative, friend, teacher, other)
_____	_____
_____	_____

Thinking about these people, how often do they: (Circle the correct response.)

		Almost Never	Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Almost Always
a.	Talk with you about schoolwork	1	2	3	4
b.	Talk with you about your feelings	1	2	3	4

appropriate for older adolescents. The locus of control scale, despite its name as the "abbreviated seventh- through 12th-grade scale," had been used successfully on third- through 12th-graders (Robinson et al., 1991). Only the social support questions were being used for the first time in this study. The questions have face validity, worked well in the pretest and had an acceptable level of reliability.

The format of the self-concept questions also caused concern. (See Figure B.1.) When questions with a similar format were used with an 18- to 21-year-old group as part of another P/PV research project, several respondents checked boxes on one side and circled "This is really true for me" or "This is sort of true for me" on the other side, thereby invalidating their response. To avoid a similar situation, the instructions were carefully explained by research staff and staff reviewed a sample question to ensure that the mentees understood the proper procedures for completing the questions. In addition, the questions were placed near the beginning of the questionnaire so they would not be prone to subject fatigue.

Mentees also had the option of completing the questionnaire in Spanish. Program directors or student coordinators asked Spanish-speaking mentees, most of whom were bilingual, whether they preferred to complete the questionnaire in English or Spanish. Two mentees elected to complete the Spanish version.

The attitudinal questions administered to the mentors were drawn from four sources. The five self-concept scales (global self-worth, scholastic competence, social acceptance, parental relationships and close friendships) were drawn from Neemann and Harter's (1986) self-perception profile for college students. The self-esteem questions were developed by Rosenberg (1979), and the powerlessness scale is a slightly modified version of a scale developed by Neal and Seeman (1964). The self-concept and self-esteem scales are widely used and have garnered wide acceptance. All three sets of scales have sound and extensively tested psychometric properties. The scales measuring various aspects of communication competence and behavior are three (social confirmation, social experience, appropriate disclosure) of the six subscales from Spitzberg's (1988) communicative adaptability scale. Figure B.2 provides examples of the mentor questions.

Pretests were conducted for both the mentor and the youth questionnaires. The mentee questionnaire was pretested on youth in the Georgetown University program, which did not participate in the youth outcomes study. The mentor outcomes questionnaire was pretested on a group of Philadelphia-area college students who had participated in a similar mentoring program. Both pretests were successful; only minor adjustments to the questionnaires resulted.

Questionnaire Administration

The baseline questionnaires were administered as close as possible to the beginning of the program; follow-up questionnaires were administered as near as practicable to the

Figure B.2

EXAMPLES OF MENTOR SELF-CONCEPT, SELF-ESTEEM, COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES

SELF-CONCEPT

On the next few pages are statements that describe different kinds of college students. We are interested in what kind of student you are. There are no right or wrong answers since students differ markedly.

There are two parts to each item. First read the two statements and decide whether you are more like the students described in the statement on the left or more like those on the right and check the appropriate box.

Once you've decided which sentence best describes you, indicate whether the statement is really true for you or only sort of true for you.

So for each pair of statements, you will check only one box and then circle 1 or 2 underneath the statement you have selected.

a)	☐	Some students like the kind of person they are.	BUT	☐	Other students wish that they were different.
	1)	This is really true for me.		1)	This is really true for me.
	2)	This is sort of true for me.		2)	This is sort of true for me.

SELF-ESTEEM

We would like to ask you some questions about how you feel about yourself in general. For each of the following statements, please circle 1 if you strongly disagree, 2 if you somewhat disagree, 3 if you somewhat agree or 4 if you strongly agree.

		Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
a.	At times I think I am no good at all.	1	2	3	4
b.	I certainly feel useless at times.	1	2	3	4

Figure B.2 (Continued)

EXAMPLES OF MENTOR SELF-CONCEPT, SELF-ESTEEM,
COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR

The following are statements about communication behaviors. Answer each item as it relates to your general style of communication (the type of communicator you are most often) in social situations. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling 1 if it is **never true** of you, 2 if it is **rarely true** of you, 3 if it is **sometimes true**, 4 if **often true** or 5 if **always true**.

		Never True	Rarely True	Sometimes True	Often True	Always True
a.	I try to make the other person feel good.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	I like to be active in different social groups.	1	2	3	4	5

POWERLESSNESS

Now we would like to find out how you feel about certain events we face in our society. Each item consists of a pair of statements. First select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you believe is **more true**. Then indicate whether you agree with this statement strongly or mildly.

☐ I think we have adequate means for preventing a recession.

OR

☐ There is very little we can do to prevent a recession.

I agree with the chosen statement:

1) strongly
2) mildly

Figure B.2 (Continued)

EXAMPLES OF MENTOR SELF-CONCEPT, SELF-ESTEEM, COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES

☐ Persons like myself have little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with strong interest groups.

OR

☐ I feel that we have adequate ways of coping with interest groups.

I agree with the chosen statement:

1) strongly
2) mildly

end of the program. The youth outcomes questionnaires were read to the mentees in a classroom setting. These questionnaires were read to the mentees to ensure that effects of differences in reading ability would be minimized and so that section-specific instructions could be explained.

The mentor questionnaires were self-administered in a classroom setting. Program staff requested that mentors attend a group meeting, at which P/PV staff explained the purpose of the study and asked the mentors to complete the questionnaire. Several mentors who were unable to attend the group meeting took the questionnaires home and completed them.

Sample Attrition

Tables B.2 and B.3 present the baseline and follow-up response rates for mentees and mentors. The baseline response rates are excellent despite being somewhat ambiguous at two sites.[8] Among the mentees, the response rate was 100 percent at Boston University, Connecticut College and Xavier University.

Mentor response rates were somewhat lower. The response rate was at or near 100 percent at Connecticut College, Georgetown University, Porterville Community College and West Virginia Wesleyan College. The response rate at Boston University was 70 percent and the rate at Xavier University was 60 percent.

The youth response rate (80%) on the follow-up survey is within an acceptable range, but the low mentor response rate (59.5%) is troubling and warrants further investigation. The low mentor response rate can be attributed to three sites: Boston University had a zero percent response rate, Xavier University had a 41.7 percent rate and Porterville Community College had a 45.5 percent rate. The attrition rate from baseline to follow-up means that when examining the outcomes, one must interpret the results with the caveat that they reflect only those sample members who completed both surveys.

The usual hypothesis associated with sample attrition is that sample members who do not complete the follow-up survey are more likely to have had a negative experience in the program or to have been the least likely to succeed in the first place. If this were true, including these sample members would decrease the magnitude of positive outcomes while increasing the magnitude of negative outcomes.

To test whether the mentors who completed one survey were different from those who completed both, the baseline data of the two groups were compared. If the sample attrition was random, there should be no differences in the baseline characteristics of the

[8]Two schools (Boston University and Xavier University) did not have a clear roster of program participants at baseline, so their baseline response rates reflect our informed estimates of the total number of participants.

Table B.2

MENTEE RESPONSE RATE FOR BASELINE
AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEYS

Site	Baseline		Follow-up	
	Number Completed	Percentage	Number Completed	Percentage
Boston University	20	100%	18	90%
Connecticut College	20	100	14	70
Xavier University	25	100	20	80
Overall	65	100%	52	80%

Table B.3

MENTOR RESPONSE RATE FOR BASELINE AND FOLLOW-UP SURVEYS

Site	Baseline		Follow-up	
	Number Completed	Percentage	Number Completed	Percentage
Boston University	14	70 %	0	0 %
Connecticut College	20	100	17	85.0
Georgetown University	19	95	15	78.9
Porterville Community College	11	100	5	45.5
West Virginia Wesleyan College	8	100	8	100
Xavier University	12	60	5	41.7
Overall	84	84.8%	50	59.5%

two groups. A random attrition problem generates less concern than non-random attrition since it is less likely to be associated with the program.

However, there were significant differences between the mentors who completed only the baseline survey and those who completed both surveys. Baseline measures of outcome variables, the mentors' perceptions of the role of a mentor, and the benefits the mentors thought that they would get out of the program were compared. Mentors who completed both surveys had significantly higher baseline scores on the scale that measured the respondents' ability to make close friends and on the communication competence scale, which measured the respondents' attempts to make the "other person" feel good or important. Mentors who completed only the baseline survey were more likely to think that loaning the mentee money was part of the role of a mentor and to indicate that they had volunteered in order to use their experience or skills to guide the mentee.

While not conclusive, the baseline differences, particularly on the self-concept and communication measures, suggest that the differences may not be random; the mentors who completed both surveys may have been better suited to be mentors in the first place. The results of the relationship formation study indicate that mentors who focused on the mentees and made them feel important were more likely to have had a positive relationship. In addition, the mentors' ability to make close friends would certainly be helpful in a mentoring relationship.

Analytic Strategy

The maximum sample sizes for the analyses were 52 for the mentees and 50 for the mentors--the numbers who completed both the baseline and the follow-up surveys. To maintain the maximum number of cases, the item means were substituted for missing values in calculating scale scores. Variables that were analyzed by a single item were analyzed for the sample with valid responses.

Reliability (internal consistency) tests were performed on all scales at baseline and follow-up for mentors and mentees. Only two scales for the mentees and two for the mentors had a Cronbach's alpha below the acceptable level of 0.60. For the mentees, scholastic competence (.56) and social acceptance (.57) were less than 0.60. (See Table B.4.) Both scales were included in the analysis, however, since they were only minimally below the acceptable level and were above the acceptable level at baseline.

For the mentors, only two scales fell below the 0.60 level: scholastic competence at baseline (.58) and social acceptance at follow-up (.52). (See Table B.5.) All the scales were analyzed, however, given the exploratory nature of the outcomes analysis and the relative closeness to the acceptable level, and because both scales were above the acceptable level at either baseline or follow-up.

Table B.4

CRONBACH'S ALPHA FOR MENTEES ON THE
SELF-CONCEPT, LOCUS OF
CONTROL AND SOCIAL SUPPORT SCALES

SCALE	BASELINE	FOLLOW-UP
SELF-CONCEPT		
Scholastic Competence	.70	.56
Social Acceptance	.62	.57
Global Self-Worth	.64	.77
Locus of Control	.64	.71
Social Support	.81	.82
Sample Size	52	52

Table B.5

CRONBACH'S ALPHA FOR MENTORS ON THE SELF-CONCEPT, SELF-ESTEEM, COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS AND POWERLESSNESS SCALES

SCALE	BASELINE	FOLLOW-UP
SELF-CONCEPT		
Global Self-Worth	.77	.85
Scholastic Competence	.58	.78
Social Acceptance	.75	.52
Parental Relationships	.75	.85
Close Relationships	.80	.77
Self-Esteem	.73	.71
COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS		
Social Confirmation	.78	.77
Social Experience	.78	.68
Appropriate Disclosure	.70	.70
Powerlessness	.62	.63
Sample Size	50	50

The statistical analysis was straightforward. A summative variable was created for each of the five youth scales and the 10 mentor scales. For each of the scales, t-tests were used to determine whether the difference between the follow-up score and the baseline score was significantly different from zero.

For the mentees, the analyses for the social and cultural enrichment variables and changes in behavior and academic performance were similar to those for the scaled variables, except that they were for individual rather than scaled variables.